

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RODINO: Committee of Conference. H. R. 1424. A bill for the relief of T. L. Morrow (Rept. No. 583). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1087. A bill to amend title 18, section 3618, of the Code of Laws of the United States of America, to empower the courts to remit or mitigate forfeitures; with amendment (Rept. No. 584). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3095. A bill to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Klamath Tribe; with amendment (Rept. No. 585). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4473. (A bill to provide revenue, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 586)). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 4496. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 4497. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to provide for more effective consultation with interests affected by its administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 4498. A bill to permit the Ohio Society of Washington to erect a shelter house in East Potomac Park, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 4499. A bill to provide that certain women officers of the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps shall have the rank of brigadier general and that certain women officers of the Navy shall have the rank of rear admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WITHERS:

H. R. 4500. A bill granting an increase in pension to certain widows and remarried widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging enactment of legislation granting aid to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to assembly joint resolution No. 38, relating to the reopening of Birmingham General Hospital; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to senate resolution No. 310, being opposed to social-security taxes on maids and domestic help, and requesting the Senators and Representatives elected from Texas to use their utmost influence in opposition to said project; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 4501. A bill for the relief of Maria Teresa Ortega Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4502. A bill for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4503. A bill for the relief of Suzanne Marie Schartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 4504. A bill for the relief of Dr. Philip Bloemsma and Mrs. Joy Roelink Bloemsma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 4505. A bill for the relief of Tien Koo Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 4506. A bill for the relief of Marcel Duvivier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4507. A bill for the relief of John J. Braund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 4508. A bill for the relief of Dr. Abraham Richard Best; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

322. Mr. HESELTON presented a resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact certain legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 19, 1951

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 17, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, from whom all holy desires, all good counsels, and all just works do proceed: As the torch of a new day lights afresh the path of duty, we bow before Thee in humility and hope. As Thou hast bound together the free peoples of the earth, with all their differing traditions and cultures in a costly struggle to preserve their threatened liberties, hold them together, we beseech Thee, in a stern resolve which can never be broken by any sinister force bent on enslaving the earth.

Hasten, we pray, through us the day of an ampler life for all, when every man shall dwell in safety among his neighbors, free from gnawing want, free from torturing fears, free to speak his thoughts and free to choose his altar of worship. Above all other acclaim or reward in these searching days we crave the assurance of Thy approving voice: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they

shall be called the children of God." We ask it in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 18, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1025) to expand the authority of the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation to include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The message notified the Senate that the House having had under consideration the joint resolution of the Senate (S. J. Res. 70) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, had rejected the same.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 157. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation;

H. R. 302. An act to redefine the eligibility requirements for appointment of pharmacists in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 1183. An act to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers of their respective services;

H. R. 1733. An act to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2321. An act to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs;

H. R. 2995. An act to amend the joint resolution of August 8, 1946, as amended, with respect to appropriations authorized for the conduct of investigations and studies thereunder;

H. R. 3100. An act to repeal the act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1243; 48 U. S. C., sec. 353);

H. R. 3861. An act to extend to June 30, 1953, the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct home and farm-house loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3932. An act to provide vocational rehabilitation training for veterans with compensable service-connected disabilities who served on or after June 27, 1950;

H. R. 4000. An act to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insur-

ance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewals of level premium term insurance for successive 5-year periods;

H. R. 4024. An act to authorize certain easements, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4200. An act to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4260. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Department of the Interior the quartermaster experimental fuel station, Pike County, Mo.;

H. R. 4338. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Delaware River near Wilmington, Del.; and

H. R. 4393. An act to extend for 2 years the period during which free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in Korea and other specified areas shall be in effect.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the Calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 157. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation;

H. R. 2321. An act to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs; and

H. R. 4200. An act to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the Calendar.

H. R. 3861. An act to extend to June 30, 1953, the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct home and farmhouse loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 302. An act to redefine the eligibility requirements for appointment of pharmacists in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; and

H. R. 3932. An act to provide vocational rehabilitation training for veterans with compensable service-connected disabilities who served on or after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 1183. An act to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official Registers of their respective services;

H. R. 4024. An act to authorize certain easements, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4260. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Department of the Interior the quartermaster experimental fuel station, Pike County, Mo.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1733. An act to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3100. An act to repeal the act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1243; 48 U. S. C., sec. 353); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2995. An act to amend the joint resolution of August 8, 1946, as amended, with respect to appropriations authorized for the conduct of investigations and studies thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4000. An act to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewals of level premium term insurance for successive 5-year periods; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 4338. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Delaware River near Wilmington, Del.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4393. An act to extend for 2 years the period during which free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in Korea and other specified areas shall be in effect; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LEHMAN, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ABSENCE OF SENATOR WHERRY TO ATTEND THE ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent today. As a member of the President's Commission on the One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence, the Senator from Nebraska is delivering an address this noon in Philadelphia.

He is addressing a meeting there to inaugurate plans for celebration of the Fourth of July. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the city of Philadelphia, and the President's Commission of which Chief Justice Vinson is Chairman, are cooperating in plans for the celebration.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letter, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 47)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of \$225,000, for the General Services Administration, fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriation: and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH (S. Doc. No. 48)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of \$150,000 for the legislative branch, fiscal year 1951 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

A letter from the Acting Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Librarian of Congress, together with a complete set of quarterly journal of current acquisitions, the supplements to the annual report, for the year ended June 30, 1950 (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION OF ROCHESTER (N. Y.) BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Rochester (N. Y.) Bar Association, endorsing the St. Lawrence seaway project.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States resolutions known as House Joint Resolution 3 and Senate Joint Resolution 27 which are designed to implement the obligation of the United States as set forth in the 1941 St. Lawrence agreement between the United States and Canada, calling for a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway and power project; and

Whereas the said project will directly benefit local and national commerce and private enterprise by improving transportation, creating additional electric power, and conserving natural resources; and

Whereas the economic feasibility of such a project has been established by many non-partisan studies which have resulted in recommendations for the completion of said project by Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt [sic], and Truman and by the New York Governors, Smith, Roosevelt [sic], Lehman, and Dewey; and

Whereas such project will be a further step forward in the harmonious relations between the United States and Canada; and

Whereas such project will strengthen the military defenses of the United States: It is hereby

Resolved by the Rochester Bar Association, That said resolutions should be approved by the Congress of the United States.

Abram N. Jones, Chairman; Sol M. Linowitz, Vice Chairman; Leon H. Sturman (in favor of power project only); James D. Andrews; Ray F. Fowler; John Branch; Bernard M. Pogal; Harry D. Goldman; William L. Clay; S. William Rosenberg; John Lomenzo.

PRICE CONTROL OF BEEF—MEMORIAL

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution in the nature of a memorial which is being circulated in Stanton County, Nebr., remonstrating against the meat-control orders, and particularly the proposed rollbacks. I am afraid many city residents do not realize how seriously this order will affect their supply of beef in the future. Those who live in the farming country, townspeople as well as farmers, understand what is being done to meat production by these unwise and hasty orders. I am told that townspeople are signing memorials like this just the same as cattle feeders. I am presenting it now even before all the signatures are collected because we will

shortly be taking up the extension of these controls, and it is absolutely vital that Congress realize the seriousness of this problem.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STANTON COUNTY LIVESTOCK FEEDERS ASSOCIATION, STANTON, NEBR., JUNE 1951—MEMORIAL TO UNITED STATES SENATOR HUGH S. BUTLER

Whereas OPS through its infamous, discriminatory, and un-American order to roll back the price of beef cattle 18 percent or to pre-Korea levels has so drastically reduced the available supply of beef that the Government is planning to buy foreign beef for the armed services. This plan calls for supplying inferior quality foreign beef to our boys in uniform while saving the limited supply of high quality corn-fed beef for our civilians. We the undersigned believe that the boys at the front well deserve first priority on this country's supply of choice corn-fed beef. The civilians here at home are still free to strive for the elimination of OPS regulations that have increased the price of meat on the one hand and sabotaged the source of supply on the other; and

Whereas beef is much higher to the American housewife under OPS ceiling prices; and Whereas with the continuation of OPS meat rationing will soon be inevitable; and

Whereas the control of pork production is next on OPS schedule; and

Whereas thousands of OPS-ers (snoop troops) have been employed at public expense to prey on the industry; and

Whereas wide-scale black market operations including such practices as illegal slaughtering, tie-in sales, up grading, and devious ways of cutting beef, are now well under way; and

Whereas, many World War II veterans just getting started in the cattle business are either being wiped out or thrown for serious financial loss. This, of course, applies to countless others who own cattle in every neighborhood, county, and State in the United States. The roll-back order does not allow cost of production as proven by hundreds of feed-lot records from all over the Corn Belt. A large share of the investment in feed-lot cattle is covered by borrowed money. When a livestock feeder buys feeder cattle at the prevailing market price, and the price is rolled back 18 percent, it means the loss of all profit and part or all of the equity that the owner has in his cattle. This condition covers a large percent of the cattle on feed in the country at the present time. This is why cattlemen who bought cattle in good faith on the free open market before the roll-back are so concerned and anxious to have the roll-back canceled; and

Whereas, 80,000,000 cattle in the United States, at the close of the 18 percent roll-back period, will have been depreciated approximately \$50 per head or \$4,000,000,000. This affects nearly every one of our millions of farmers and ranchers, because cattle are owned and beef is produced on nearly every farm and ranch in the country. Even dairy or farm milk cows sold for beef will be depreciated nearly \$100 per head; and

Whereas beef cattle and related industries are in a state of paralysis. Large numbers of packing-house laborers have been laid off. Feed lots are rapidly becoming empty. For the past several weeks, during the roll-back scare period, cattle feeders have greatly reduced the buying of replacement cattle to fill their feed lots and have sold large numbers of unfinished cattle with a resulting large loss in beef tonnage. The sale of feeder cattle in the big ranch areas of the western half of the United States has practically stopped. At Wisner, Nebr., one of the largest cattle feeders in the United States has

stopped buying cattle for his feed lots because he says cattle fed under OPS regulations would only result in serious financial loss. Before OPS this feeder produced 500 top quality corn-fed cattle per week, or 300 tons live weight; 15,600 tons per year. Thus, one of our Nation's important food producing defense plants is being closed due to OPS. Many livestock trucking companies report a drastic reduction in the business of hauling feeder cattle, feed, and supplies to feed lots and finished corn-fed cattle to market; and

Whereas there is much more at stake in the roll back order than the price of cattle and meat. If the roll back is allowed to stand it will mean permanent government domination of the industry and the end of a free agriculture in the United States; and

Whereas OPS officials administering the meat program are strictly inexperienced in this industry and are totally unqualified for their positions. Neither will they heed the sincere counsel of leading men of long experience in the industry; and

Whereas an 87 percent of last year slaughterer quota on beef cattle will force cattle into the black market require that packers slaughter at least 13 percent less cattle than a year ago. Under this plan the owner of a shipment of cattle on a given market might be forced to take his cattle back home if all the buyers had filled their quotas toward the end of an accounting period; and

Whereas grain farmers look to the livestock farmer and feeder for a market for their corn, other feed grains, and hay. With an OPS forced shortage of livestock feeding, great surpluses of these commodities are certain to accumulate; and

Whereas OPS has so ruthlessly destroyed confidence in the livestock feeding industry that many feeders have lost all desire to continue their operations until such controls are eliminated; and

Whereas Mr. DiSalle has threatened to roll all farm prices back as far as the law will allow. This would mean another 20 percent roll back in the price of cattle since cattle will still be 125 percent of parity at the completion of the present 18 percent roll back. Parity is a horse and buggy formula based on the period 1909 to 1914 and has very little to do with present day conditions. Much higher quality corn fed beef is produced today under considerably higher relative production costs. For instance, in the 1909 to 1914 period poorer quality cattle were carried for much longer periods on cheap pasture; much of which was free public domain. Today highly bred corn-fed cattle are marketed as baby beefs, yearlings, and 2-year olds. In the previous period cattle were marketed mainly as 2-, 3-, and 4-year olds; many as grass finished beef; and

Whereas every division of the meat industry, including livestock feeders, farmers, processors, and retailers stand ready and willing to supply the American consumer and the armed services with an ample and ever increasing supply of meat at reasonable prices as determined by consumer demand, if left unhampered by OPS controls; be it

Resolved, That we, the undersigned farmers, livestock feeders, and other interested parties of Stanton County, Nebr., most urgently request you, Senator HUGH BUTLER, to do everything possible to prevent the renewal of any legislation affecting the livestock industry when the National Production Act expires June 30.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 3605. A bill to amend section 6 of Public Law 134, approved July 6, 1945, as amended, to grant annual and sick leave privileges to certain indefinite substitute

employees in the postal service; without amendment (Rept. No. 443); and

H. R. 4393. A bill to extend for 2 years the period during which free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in Korea and other specified areas shall be in effect; without amendment (Rept. No. 444).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1696. A bill to amend Public Law 587 of the Eighty-first Congress (approved June 30, 1950) to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special quota immigration visas available to certain alien shepherders; and

S. 1697. A bill for the relief of Sister Maria Gasperez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1698. A bill to provide for the education, medical attention, relief of distress, and social welfare of Indians in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1699. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to authorize the Federal Power Commission to prescribe safety requirements for natural-gas companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference three bills, the first of which deals with the transportation of fireworks in interstate and foreign commerce for use in violation of State laws; the second deals with the suspension of certain rates of duty on steel, and the third deals with the imposition of penalties under the Federal Narcotics Act, with special emphasis on the imposition of the death penalty on persons who purvey narcotics to minors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1700. A bill to prohibit the transportation of fireworks in interstate and foreign commerce for use in violation of State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1701. A bill to suspend certain rates of duty on steel; and

S. 1702. A bill to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotic laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 1703. A bill to exempt certain wholesale marketers of petroleum from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1933; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CONNALLY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. O'CONNOR):

S. 1704. A bill to amend section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, relating to transfer of vessels documented under the laws of the United States to foreign citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution to provide for a codification of regulations of agencies and departments of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN WHOLESALE MARKETERS OF PETROLEUM FROM PROVISIONS OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to exempt certain wholesale marketers of petroleum from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1703) to exempt certain wholesale marketers of petroleum from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, introduced by Mr. CONNALLY, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 (a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "or (16) any employee of an employer engaged in the business of dealing in petroleum products as a commission merchant, factor, consignee, wholesaler, or distributor, if at least 50 percent of such employer's annual dollar volume of sales in the course of such business is made to retail service stations or local agricultural consumers, or to both, and at least 85 percent of such employer's annual dollar volume of sales in the course of such business is made within the State in which his principal place of business is located."

The statement by Mr. CONNALLY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CONNALLY

Last week I called the attention of the Senate to the activities of the Wage-Hour Division of the Department of Labor in attempting to apply the Fair Labor Standards Act, commonly known as the Wage-Hour Act, to wholesale petroleum marketers.

I pointed out that, by any reasonable test, these marketers are not engaged in interstate commerce and therefore do not come under the Wage-Hour law. Most of their operations are in a single county and within a radius of 30 miles and therefore cannot be in interstate commerce. But the Wage-Hour Administrator is nevertheless attempting to bring them under the law, notwithstanding the plain intent of Congress to the contrary.

In order to make the meaning of the law perfectly clear, I am today introducing a bill to amend section 13 (a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act. This is the section dealing with employees specifically exempt from the minimum wages and maximum hours provisions of the law. My bill would add employees of certain wholesale petroleum marketers to this list.

PRINTING OF REPORT ENTITLED "MANPOWER UTILIZATION AT MILITARY INDOCTRINATION CENTERS" (S. DOC. NO. 46)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Preparedness Subcommittee, Committee on Armed Services, entitled Twenty-sixth Report, "Manpower Utilization at Military Indoctrination Centers," be printed as a Senate document.

This report was based upon a thorough investigation by the subcommittee of manpower practices at 16 military indoctrination centers. We believe it has already resulted in some constructive steps and that additional steps will be taken to remedy an unfortunate situation. I am sure the Senators will be interested in reading this report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1694) to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, and for other purposes, introduced on behalf of myself and several other Senators on June 18, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. KILGORE:

Address on the achievements of the supply services, delivered by him before the European Theater Operation, Quartermaster Association, New York City, June 9, 1951.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him at the Baltic freedom rally in Carnegie Hall, New York, June 16, 1951, and address by Edward M. O'Connor on the subject The Tragedy of the Baltic States, on the same occasion.

Editorial entitled "Mucking," published in the Washington Post of June 19, 1951, relating to charges made by Senator McCARTHY.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address entitled "This Year of Decision," delivered by Samuel F. Pryor, vice president and assistant to the president of Pan-American World Airways, on June 13, 1951, in Milwaukee, Wis.

By Mr. NIXON:

Memorial Day address entitled "Over Silent Graves," delivered by Bishop Timothy Manning at Sawtelle Veterans Hospital.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Statement regarding the effect of controls, by Charles J. MacGowan, international president of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers and Helpers, A. F. of L.

Article entitled "Bulletin No. 84. How the 48 States Would Share the Cost of the President's \$8,500,000,000 Foreign-Aid Program," appearing in Federal Spending Facts, published by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce.

By Mr. KEM:

Article entitled "Query on Kansas City Vote Theft Stirs Applause at Optimist Lunch," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of June 16, 1951.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Article entitled "Roll-Backs Won't Produce More Beef," published in the Nebraska Farmer of June 2, 1951.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

Essay entitled "Freedom's Open Door," written by Richard Samuel Sterns, of Skowhegan, Maine, second award winner in State competition sponsored by Women's Auxiliary, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Address delivered by Senator WHERRY in Philadelphia, Pa., on June 19, 1951, as a member of the President's Commission for the Celebration of the One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Address entitled "Danger Signs in Our Domestic Economy," delivered by him at the annual banquet of the national convention of the American Plant Food Council, at the Homestead, Hot Springs, Va., June 16, 1951.

Address entitled "The Duties of a Citizen," delivered by George E. Stringfellow, vice president, Thomas A. Edison Co., Inc., before the Kiwanis Club at Elizabeth, N. J., on June 7, 1951.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Statement on the Fulbright resolution to establish a Commission on Ethics in the Federal Government, made by Senator BENTON before a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on June 19, 1951.

By Mr. BENTON:

Letter from Rev. Charles Brainard Hart regarding Peace Sunday, and a statement of Christian interpretation of international relations by the International Relations Committee of the Connecticut Council of Churches.

Letter regarding oppression in Communist-controlled Hungary, from Laszlo Boros, of Connecticut, publisher and editor of the newspaper The American Hungarian.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

An address delivered by Mr. George L. P. Weaver, Special Assistant to the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board at the commencement exercises of Livingstone College, Salisbury, N. C.

WASTEFUL PROCUREMENT PRACTICES OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as we debate the cost of government, and as we labor in this Chamber to eliminate unnecessary expenditures, it is discouraging to realize that our Department of Defense has not yet been able to solve its simplest procurement problem, the problem of buying an insignificant item without using all the cumbersome and expensive machinery it employs in purchasing materials the cost of which runs into the millions of dollars. I have in my hand a letter from a paint manufacturer in Chicago telling me that he received a request to bid on four pints of paint, a request in triplicate mailed from Washington, as it must have been mailed to hundreds of other paint manufacturers. The irony of the situation is emphasized by the fact that this order, which if he had chosen to bid, would have represented a purchase of approximately \$2, contained this statement: "No partial payments will be made on resulting order."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEWELL PAINT & VARNISH Co.,
Chicago, May 31, 1951.

Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have before me a bid form—Request for Proposal and Contractor's Proposal—that is in no respect unique, but illustrates so well a type of wasteful and unreasonable purchasing practice extant among some agencies of the Government that I feel impelled to call it to your attention.

The form is a request for a bid from the Chief, AFSA Procurement Office, Armed Forces Security Agency, Washington, dated May 4, 1951. How many firms received this request I have no way of knowing, but the fact that it was sent to us in Chicago would imply that the list must have been fairly long. Proposals are to be submitted in triplicate by May 18, 1951—4:30 p. m., delivery f. o. b. Arlington, Va.

Now all the above is perfectly normal, and the procedure is similar to that regularly employed by procurement officers in obtaining bids for a tremendous variety and quantity of commodities, including paints. But in this case the quantity on which bids are requested is four pints of "Wrinkle Varnish, black, air-drying for machines." No special specifications or requirements, just a regular black wrinkle finish that is a product of a long list of manufacturers. Only the fact that it is to be the air-drying variety, rather than baking, makes it anything but a regular stock item. Its value, if we had entered a bid—which we did not—would be about \$2.25 total, plus parcel post or express charges.

What the cost of making such a purchase is I can't estimate, but the preparation of bid forms in quadruplicate for each prospective bidder and their distribution by mail must in itself run to a sizable figure. Add to that the opening and tabulation, final preparation of vouchers and forms, and the value of the merchandise itself must be a very small fraction indeed of the cost of purchasing it.

If this were an isolated case it would be rather comic, and a statement on the reverse side of the form that "No partial payments will be made on resulting order" adds to its ludicrous aspect. But as an example of painfully wasteful practice that is unnecessary it isn't so funny. One of the nearby Navy installations takes care of such small items by making cash purchases from the nearest source, just as you or I would buy a package of razor blades from the handiest drugstore, which makes a lot more sense.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT O. CLARK,
President.

INDEPENDENT OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS,
1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], lettered "R."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	George	McKellar
Anderson	Green	McMahon
Bennett	Hayden	Millikin
Benton	Hendrickson	Monroney
Brewster	Hennings	Moody
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	O'Connor
Byrd	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Cain	Ives	Pastore
Capchert	Jenner	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Clements	Kem	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Langer	Sparkman
Douglas	Lehman	Taft
Duff	Lodge	Thye
Eastland	Long	Watkins
Eaton	Magnuson	Welker
Ellender	Maybank	Wiley
Ferguson	McCarran	Williams
Flanders	McCarthy	Young
Frear	McClellan	
Fulbright	McFarland	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Tennessee [KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KEER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference now being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent on official business as a member of the President's Commission on the One Hundred Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, 15 minutes are allowed to each side, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, my amendment would amend the bill at page 2, line 17, by striking out the figure "\$1,883,615", and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "\$1,585,553." It would represent a reduction of approximately \$300,000.

The reason for taking the latter figure is that it represents the exact amount which was allowed to the President during the past fiscal year. Frankly, I seriously question the advisability of allowing even this much for salaries and expenses of the White House Office, but surely there can be no argument whatever made for the increase which is recommended.

The argument has been advanced that the President might need more money this year than he did last year, but that is still no reason why the amount proposed by my amendment should not be adopted and the reduction made, since it is a matter of record that last year the President had more money than he could use properly. Since he has the usual New Deal bureaucratic aversion to returning any unused funds to the Federal Treasury we found that out of these funds he assigned a Government car, chauffeur, and other personnel to conveying his sister on an unofficial tour of the country.

Last Thursday night President Truman, when speaking to the country, made an eloquent appeal to the American people for their cooperation in reducing their own individual expenditures to the barest minimum as their contribution to the fight against inflation.

Surely the President of the United States would not want Congress to make an exception of his own personal expense allowance and thereby place him in the category of those selfish people whom he so bitterly denounced as individuals who were always willing to call on the other fellow for sacrifices but always end their appeals with the statement, "Cut the other fellow's but don't cut mine."

It is in an effort to place the President's expense account in line with all other appropriation cuts and also in line with his own statements that I am offering this amendment and urging that it be adopted.

This amendment has no reference to the special \$50,000 tax exemption allowance which is enjoyed by the President, which question will be taken up when the tax bill arrives from the House.

This amendment refers only to his miscellaneous expense allowance.

In reviewing the past years, we find that the following amounts were allowed to Mr. Truman's predecessor in the White House:

1944.....	\$302,190
1945.....	339,131
1946.....	312,583

We find the following figures after Mr. Truman took office:

1947.....	\$383,660
1948.....	952,500
1949.....	969,612
1950.....	1,375,140
1951.....	1,585,553

Now we are being asked to appropriate \$1,883,615. Remember, there is no accounting required for these vast expenditures.

Mr. President, I believe the time has come when we must call a halt to such

lavish expenses. There is no reason why the President should require such a large sum of money for entertainment expenses. It is nearly five times as much money as was spent on the same item by President Truman's predecessor. Frankly, I feel that we should go much further than my amendment proposes to go. Certainly, making this mild reduction I propose is the very least we should consider and would be taking a step in the right direction. We should at least put the figure back where it was last year, when, as I said before, apparently the President had more money than he could properly spend, otherwise he would not have assigned a Government car and chauffeur to take his sister on an unofficial tour of the country.

I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will accept the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Delaware yield the floor?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I shall yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Arizona. First, I should like to make a brief statement. I believe the committee was in full accord on the item. The House had made no reduction. Speaking as chairman of the subcommittee, let me say that I could not agree to take the amendment to conference; I would have to oppose it.

In the meantime, if the Senator from Arizona will bear with me, I should like to say that when the Senator from Arizona completes his 4-minute statement, I wish to have the clerk read a letter which came to me from the Atomic Energy Commission. I believe the letter is of great consequence. Yesterday I showed it to the Senator from Michigan, but I should like to have the letter read into the RECORD. I think there will be time to have that done, unless some other Senator wishes to have me yield time to him.

Mr. President, let me inquire how much time I have remaining.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAYBANK. Then I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Arizona, if he desires to have that much time; and at the completion of his remarks I shall ask that the clerk read the letter to which I have referred.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Delaware will not insist on this amendment. During the time I have been in the Senate, no attempt has ever been made in any way to change the amount requested by the President as the appropriation for an item such as this one. For the Congress to interfere with the appropriations for the President's office would be just the same as for the President to interfere with appropriations for the Congress or to veto them. It is simply one of the things which are not done.

I have made inquiry; and during the short time I have had since the Senator offered his amendment, I have not been able to find any precedent for the action the Senator suggests. I have not been able to find any case in which the

Congress has cut down the appropriation items for use by the President in connection with conducting his office.

So, Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Delaware will not insist on his amendment. It is not in keeping with the precedents of the Congress, and I am sure that no good would come by our taking such action as is proposed by the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has requested unanimous consent that a letter to which he has referred be read at the desk. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY
COMMISSION,

Washington, D. C., June 15, 1951.

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Independent Offices, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: The Independent Offices Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1952, as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee, on June 13, 1951, contains the following provision under the appropriation language for the Atomic Energy Commission:

"Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be used for any new construction project until after the Commission shall have notified the architects and engineers involved that the plans for such projects should be purely utilitarian and without unnecessary refinements."

We believe this provision may adversely affect the scheduled completion of the present large construction program of the Commission. The purpose of this letter is to request that such language be eliminated from the bill.

The Commission, as part of its method of doing business has had as one of its goals the objective apparently sought by this language. In addition to the continuing surveillance of the construction program to assure that facilities are entirely utilitarian in design and do not contain unnecessary refinements, the General Manager recently reemphasized existing instructions to the field offices to assure that these objectives are being accomplished. A copy of his memorandum to all managers of operations is attached. Moreover, we are considering the employment of a well-known architect-engineer, with considerable experience in this field, to survey the work being performed by our architect engineers to determine what, if any, further measures could be taken, including possible standardization of design for certain types of buildings, to accomplish this objective.

Our concern with the proposed language is not with its basic purpose but with the effect it may well have on our contractors and, consequently, on our ability to get our construction jobs done. The language, literally applied, places a restriction on the availability of our appropriations. It is our understanding that this restriction would be removed in any case where the Commission gave the proposed notification to the architects and engineers involved. However, the language will, we anticipate, raise immediately in the minds of our contractors numerous questions as to whether they will be reimbursed under the terms of their contracts with the Commission. Because of the indefiniteness of the standards "purely utilitarian and without unnecessary refinements," and other interpretive difficulties, construction and architect-engineer contractors may well be reluctant to assume the risks of doing business with the Commission. The following are illustrations of the difficulties we an-

ticipate if the quoted language is included in our appropriation act:

1. The required notification of an architect-engineer firm could reasonably be interpreted both by the firm and by the construction contractor as making compliance with the notice a condition of reimbursement. The question of what constitutes "purely utilitarian and without unnecessary refinements" is one on which men of experience and sound judgment could well differ. Contractors may be concerned that the architect-engineer's best judgment could later be questioned not only by the Commission but by other agencies of the Government and that, therefore, funds would not be available to reimburse either the construction contractor or the architect-engineer for the costs of the construction project. The risk thereby imposed would probably make more difficult obtaining the services of qualified firms.

2. Many of our contracts with firms of architect-engineers are subcontracts made by our principal operating contractors, such as du Pont and General Electric. We are concerned that they would also interpret the quoted language as making reimbursement to them conditioned on their architect-engineer complying with the rider. We anticipate that they would be reluctant to proceed expeditiously with the work with the assumption of this risk.

3. The specifications for many of our facilities are provided in the first instance by the responsible operating contractor to meet operating requirements. It is often necessary to include what might be considered elaborate safeguards to protect against unusual hazards associated with the project. An architect-engineer firm may well differ with the judgment of the operating contractor and the Commission as to whether certain of these features are purely utilitarian. We could not be in the position of substituting the judgment of the architect-engineer for the judgment of the operating contractor and of the Commission. The design might well be unduly delayed while agreement with the architect-engineer is being sought.

4. To complete our construction program on schedule it is necessary to start construction and procurement on some of the most important projects in the early stages of design. Contractors may believe that it is necessary to delay construction and procurement until the design is completed and a final determination made as to whether it is purely utilitarian and without unnecessary refinements.

5. Contractors may also be concerned as to the possible retroactive application of this language. Design of a number of our urgently required facilities is nearing completion. Since the architect-engineers will not have received notification in the proposed formal statutory words, a possible interpretation of language might lead to insistence upon a complete review of all construction plans before proceeding further with construction work. This could result in an extensive delay in completion of the project and considerably increased cost, since in many cases construction will already have been started.

We are in agreement with the objectives proposed to be attained through this language. We believe that this can best continue to be done administratively by the Commission without adversely affecting the construction schedules presently established. If such an objective becomes a matter of law, we believe that it may interpose many obstructions to the speedy accomplishment of the Commission's construction program.

We would appreciate an opportunity to discuss this matter with you and members of your committee. Copies of this letter are

being sent to the chairman, Independent Offices Subcommittee, House Appropriations Committee, and to the Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, for their information.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON DEAN,
Chairman.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina also wish to have the clerk read the paper which is attached to the letter?

Mr. MAYBANK. No, Mr. President; I do not think that is necessary. However, I should like to have it printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the attachment to the letter will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The attachment to the foregoing letter is as follows:

APRIL 10, 1951.

ALL MANAGERS OF OPERATIONS,

M. W. BOYER,

General Manager, Washington:

ECONOMY OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

It is appropriate at this time to reiterate the policy of the Commission concerning the design and construction of facilities required for the program. A determined effort must be made to assure that facilities are designed and constructed with that forthright simplicity that will effect the maximum of economics in money and critical materials, while fully satisfying the functional adequacy for which intended, and with due regard for vulnerability criteria developed for individual installations.

Bulletin GM-127—"Building Codes and Other Building Criteria" established the basic building codes to be considered as minimum requirements for the appropriate classes of structures and at the same time stated that the policies of the Commission require that economy, safety, and uniform good practice be followed in the design and construction of work built for the Commission's use.

Under date of December 19, 1950, I sent to all managers of operations a memorandum concerning the conservation of critical materials, which called attention to the fact that the President was directing the executive agencies "to conduct a detailed review of Government programs, for the purpose of modifying them wherever practicable to lessen the demand upon services, commodities, raw materials, manpower, and facilities. The Government, as well as the public, must exercise great restraint in the use of those goods and services which are needed for our increased defense efforts." This memorandum further stated that it is the responsibility of managers of operations to screen all design to assure that no critical materials are used where it is practicable to use noncritical substitutes.

Steps have been taken to initiate a conservation coordinating committee, comprising representatives of major Government agencies, under the auspices of the Defense Production Administration to ensure that savings of manpower, materials, and industrial services, as well as dollars are attained to the greatest extent possible through simplification, standardization, substitution, and conservation. In a period such as exists today, with the unprecedented industrial expansion which the Nation is undergoing, even economies of dollars are far outweighed by economies of critical materials.

Bulletin GM-128 "Supervision of Construction and Related Activities" set forth the responsibility of the operations offices and the Washington office in ensuring that such economies are met. It is the responsibility of the operations offices to screen all preliminary proposals, designs, and specifica-

tions to insure that both economy and functional adequacy are obtained. There is also set forth, under paragraph 4c of the bulletin, the requirement for submitting preliminary proposals in duplicate on proposed projects to the Washington office for review as to general functional adequacy, practicability, and feasibility of basic design for construction of proposed facilities. In most cases, such submissions have not been timely and the purpose of the submission therefore has been largely nullified. I would like to call your attention at this time to the necessity for timely and informative submissions and your responsibility for doing same.

I want you to forward copies of this memorandum to the principal operating contractors and architect-engineers engaged at your installations to reaffirm our policy concerning economy of design in effecting functional and utilitarian facilities.

In the near future I plan to visit all offices of operations and will discuss this subject with you and key personnel of your principal contractors.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me about 1 minute?

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall be glad to yield. Mr. President, how many minutes do I have remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee as much of the 5 minutes as he may desire.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall need but a moment. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona has stated the case very frankly and fully. In support of what he has said, let me say to the Senator from Delaware, whom I admire very much, that so far as I recall, this is the first time in my long service in the Senate the Congress has ever been asked to interfere with the Executive's appropriations. The appropriations for the Executive Office have been agreed to in all cases without any objection, just as the President does not interfere with the legislative appropriations which we make. I do not think he should, and I do not think we should interfere with the Executive appropriations. I hope the Senator will not insist upon the amendment, because, while I am very much in favor of economies, as the Senator knows, and as I have demonstrated time and again, I do not believe we ought to change this appropriation for the President of the United States.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The junior Senator from South Dakota would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee whether he does not recall the instance, a few years ago, when the Chief Executive sought to change the White House structure and to convert it more or less into a modern office building, at which time there was considerable discussion about it. At that time I think the distinguished Senator from Tennessee was opposed to the change. He may recall that the House of Representatives adopted an amendment to an appropriation bill which reappropriated the funds from which it had been proposed to pay for the remodeling of the White House,

and directed that those funds should be used for other purposes connected with the White House; which, in principle, expressed the opinion of Congress with regard to the expenditure of funds in connection with the White House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may say to the Senator that I recall it very distinctly; but it was a different item entirely. I was utterly opposed to changing the White House or to building a new one. I so stated on many occasions.

Mr. CASE. I may say to the distinguished Senator, it was an opposition which I shared.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. I think we are going to have a wonderful White House, when the improvements now under way are completed, which will probably be by November 1. I wish to say in regard to the particular appropriation referred to by the Senator from South Dakota that it was, of course, an entirely different thing. It was for the building of a new White House or the reconstruction of the present one. It was not an appropriation of money to be used for the personal expenses of the President in connection with his office. As I have said, so far as I know—and I have been here for quite a while, and there are those in my State who think I have been here too long—this is the first time that a question has ever been raised as to appropriations for the President's personal expenses. The Senator from South Dakota has served a long time in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. We have had two wars lately, and even during those wars nothing was said about appropriations in this category, and they were always passed. I hope the Senate will allow this one to be passed also.

Mr. CASE. The reason the Senator from South Dakota raised the question—

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield that 1 minute to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in voting on this amendment I shall follow the committee action. I shall do so, cause I believe that the personal expenditures of the President should not be questioned, any more than we question the expenditures of the House of Representatives, or any more than the House of Representatives questions the expenditure of the Senate.

I should like to point out, however, that the President apparently intends to add 35 persons to his staff. In a period such as this, every effort should be made to effect economies. I think we should bear this in mind, and I hope the President will not find it necessary to expend the entire appropriation. From his 1950 appropriation the President had remaining, after all expenditures, \$115,426. In 1951 he had \$150,000 remaining, though he spent \$45,020 of the 1950

amount which was carried over. In 1952 he estimates that he will have remaining \$170,615, but that he will carry over from prior years \$100,000. I hope the President will not find it necessary to add so many new employees to his staff and that he will not require all the money the bill provides. I, personally, shall not vote to cut it down, because the personal expenditures of the President have never been questioned by the Congress, I believe, in our history.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may say that I hope the President will not appoint the additional employees to whom reference has been made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware has some time left.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to say first that I, too, have examined the record and I agree with what the Senator from Arizona has said regarding precedents. To my knowledge, this is without precedent. Perhaps that accounts for today's excessive expenditures. I might add that there is no precedent within the past 18 years of the Administration having made any sincere effort to cut the appropriations of any of the departments. But that is all the more reason my amendment should be adopted. It is high time that the Congress established a precedent by calling not only upon the heads of the executive departments but also upon the President to cut out their extravagance and to begin rendering some account to the American people of the moneys spent.

Perhaps the expense accounts of the Presidents who preceded the present incumbent of the White House were not questioned, but I point out that, for the years 1944, 1945, and 1946, which were the war years, at no time, even at the peak of the war, did President Roosevelt spend more than \$350,000 in this same classification. Last year the cost was almost five times that much, and we are being asked now for another \$300,000 increase.

If we are to continue this trend through the years and not call a halt sometime, where is it going to stop? I certainly shall insist on this amendment. I think it is time we established a precedent. So far as the argument is concerned that there has been no check placed upon the Senate and the House of Representatives, I may say that we should put a check on ourselves. The time has come when we must check them all. The President of the United States has himself said that those who would exempt their own budgets and be excused from cuts are selfish. Surely no Senator on this floor wants to put the President of the United States into the classification of the selfish individuals whom he so bitterly denounced.

I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bricker	Ives	Monroney
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Case	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Ferguson	Lehman	Saltonstall
Frear	Maybank	Welker
George	McFarland	Williams
Hill	McKellar	
Holland	McMahon	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The names of the absent Senators were called, and Mr. BENTON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BYRD, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. LODGE, Mr. THYE and Mr. YOUNG answered to their names when called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Sergeant-at-Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant-at-Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. HOEY, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. WILEY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. DUFF, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KEM, and Mr. AIKEN entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

After a little further delay, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SCHOEPEL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. WATKINS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No business has been transacted since the roll call for a quorum just completed.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood that, but I wanted to make it clear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays were ordered. The Chair assumes that that may be regarded as business. Does the Senator insist on his point?

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Flor-

ida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] is unavoidably detained on official business, and if present would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] who is absent because of illness is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent on official business as a Member of the President's Commission on the One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence, and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are detained on official business. If present and voting the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] who is absent by leave of the Senate is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. If present and voting, the Senator from New

Hampshire would vote "yea" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—37

Aiken	Ecton	Millikin
Bennett	Ferguson	Mundt
Brewster	Flanders	Robertson
Bricker	Frear	Schoeppel
Bridges	Hendrickson	Smith, Maine
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. J.
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Thye
Byrd	Jenner	Watkins
Cain	Kem	Welker
Carlson	Knowland	Williams
Case	Lodge	Young
Cordon	McCarran	
Duff	McClellan	

NAYS—36

Anderson	Hoey	McFarland
Benton	Holland	McKellar
Chavez	Humphrey	McMahon
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Monroney
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Moody
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Eastland	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Langer	Pastore
George	Lehman	Russell
Green	Long	Saltostall
Hayden	Magnuson	Smith, N. C.
Hill	Maybank	Sparkman

NOT VOTING—23

Capehart	Kerr	Smathers
Dirksen	Malone	Stennis
Dworshak	Martin	Taft
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tobey
Gillette	Morse	Underwood
Hennings	Murray	Wherry
Hunt	Nixon	Wiley
Kefauver	O'Connor	

So, Mr. WILLIAMS' amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which is substantially the same as the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], except that it would reduce the amount from \$1,883,615 to \$1,685,553. It would increase the amount appropriated last year by \$100,000, but would diminish the amount provided in the bill by approximately \$200,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,883,615" and in lieu thereof insert "\$1,685,553."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is not in order. It is an amendment to the amendment which has just been agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "6-15-51-C." It is offered to the committee amendment on page 9, in line 18.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an announcement?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the majority leader for that purpose.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement. Hereafter during the consideration of an appropriation bill I shall object to any committee meeting during the session of the Senate, except the Appropriations Committee. I will state further that I believe the Committee on Appropriations

should not meet during the consideration of appropriation bills. That committee, above all other committees, should not meet, because its members should be present on the floor of the Senate to help conduct the business of the Senate.

In spite of a limitation on debate of 30 minutes, we have spent an hour and a half considering one amendment. Hereafter I shall object to any unanimous-consent requests to permit committees to meet during the consideration of appropriation bills.

Mr. President, several Senators have asked me when we shall be able to get away from Washington. I will tell them that we will not get away for a long time, unless we can make more progress than we are now making on appropriation bills. Senators must be in attendance on the floor and they must be more attentive to their duties on the floor if we are to make any progress.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, did the majority leader except the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. McFARLAND. I believe that the members of the Appropriations Committee should want to be on the floor. That committee, above all other committees, should not meet during the consideration of appropriation bills.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree completely and for that reason I believe the majority leader should not except the Appropriations Committee. No committees should be permitted to meet during the sessions of the Senate when appropriation bills are being considered, and least of all the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations considering appropriations for the Department of the Interior is meeting this afternoon. Did I understand the majority leader to insist that the members of that subcommittee remain on the floor?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I will answer the Senator by saying that all Senators ought to be on the floor. However, the members of the subcommittee to which the Senator from New Mexico refers have already secured unanimous consent to meet this afternoon. I still say that if the members of any committee should be on the floor it is the members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course I should like to comply with the request of the Senator from Arizona. It so happens that the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] conducting the meeting of the subcommittee this afternoon. I wish to comply with the will of the Senate. If our committee is not going to be exempted, well and good; but we would like to know whether we can meet.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator's committee already has received unanimous consent to meet during the session of the Senate today. It is up to the Senator's committee to determine whether it will meet.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield, to permit me to propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, before there was any knowledge of the action to be taken by the Senate with reference to the meeting of committees while the Senate is in session, a meeting had been called for 2:30 this afternoon by the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, meeting jointly. Hereafter, when appropriation bills are under consideration in the Senate Chamber, I shall not seek to obtain consent for meetings of the two committees during the afternoon, but at least I should like to have an opportunity for the committees to meet jointly this afternoon in order that we may apprise the witnesses of the action taken, so that at least we shall be able to proceed in an orderly way.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for this afternoon the two committees, meeting jointly, may sit at 2:30 p. m.

The PRESIDING OFFICE (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? Hearing none, consent is given.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate that for this afternoon the committees to which the Senator from Georgia refers have made arrangements to meet and witnesses have been called. That was the reason for making this exception, and I think it was proper, instead of having the witnesses appear but not be able to testify.

However, I join the majority leader, as I know the Senator from Georgia, a distinguished member of the committee, does, in saying that appropriation bills are very important and worthy of full attendance on the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I stated that hereafter we would not undertake to have the two committees meet during the afternoon when appropriation bills are under consideration in the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that, and I will ask that all Senators on this side of the aisle be in attendance in the Senate Chamber, because each of these appropriation items is very important. Although I realize that all Senators feel that they have outside duties or missions of importance, yet I doubt that any of their outside missions are more important than their duties on the floor of the Senate, particularly when debate is limited and votes are being taken every few minutes on various items in appropriation bills.

I see in the Chamber the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. I would say he has spent every minute of his time on the floor of the Senate during the time when the appropriation bills have been under consideration.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In view of the fact that certain of the committees are going to meet this afternoon, I would suggest that after we vote on the pending amendment, which has been proposed by the Senator from Michigan, we take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. I shall not make that motion at this time; but certainly nothing will be accomplished this afternoon with only a few Senators in attendance. Under such circumstances, the situation in the Senate chamber will be similar to the situation here yesterday afternoon or last Friday afternoon. Until we can have many Senators present at the sessions on the floor, we are merely wasting our time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I know how the chairman of the subcommittee feels, and I join him in reiterating that these are very important matters and should have full attendance on the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate having the Senator from Michigan join me in regard to this matter. Both of us serve on the committee, and we appreciate the seriousness of the situation. There are a large number of amendments which must be considered by the Senate in connection with this bill, and certainly Senators should be present. However, not many Senators will be present this afternoon.

Therefore, when we conclude action on the pending amendment I shall make a motion that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow. If the motion is not carried, of course we shall proceed this afternoon.

Mr. FERGUSON. At the moment we have an increased attendance, and I should like to proceed with the amendment I have offered to the committee amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I count the Senators who are now in attendance, it seems to me that not as many as one-fifth of the Members of the Senate are in the Chamber at this time. Am I mistaken?

Mr. FERGUSON. Certainly considerably less than half the Members of the Senate are present, but a 50-percent attendance would be large.

Mr. MAYBANK. I count only 15 Senators present at this time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Even that is a large number, compared to other recent sessions.

Mr. MAYBANK. However, when we are considering such important matters, it seems to me that at least a quorum should be present. I shall not ask for a quorum, of course; but I make these remarks because earlier today, during the consideration of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], only five Senators were present.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the amendment I am asking to have considered at this time is offered by me, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], to the committee amendment on page 9,

in line 18, and would strike out the figure appearing at that point and would insert "\$17,500,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 9, in line 18, it is proposed to strike out "\$18,050,000" and insert "\$17,500,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the appropriations for 1951 for the same function was \$16,511,913. In other words, if my amendment is adopted, we shall be increasing the appropriation for salaries and expenses of the Civil Service Commission by \$1,000,000, less only \$11,913.

The House of Representatives voted to appropriate \$17,000,000 for this item. The amount recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee is \$18,050,000, and the amendment now proposed to the committee amendment would reduce that amount to \$17,500,000.

The Civil Service Commission requests an increase of 1,628 employees over the number it had last year, and that accounts primarily for the great increase in budget estimates.

The entire increase in funds requested is, in the words of Chairman Ramspeck at page 459 of the Senate hearings, "to process greater workloads resulting from rising Federal employment and from an anticipated increase in turn-over."

The House discounted the extent of the burden carried by the Commission in its placements, and allowed the Commission \$17,000,000, which was an increase of approximately \$500,000 over last year.

Two cuts were involved. The House committee recommended a reduction of about \$5,000,000, on the ground that turn-over estimates were inflated. The Commission had estimated turn-over rates for 1951 at about 1.4 percent per month, or 17 percent a year; but it anticipated a turn-over rate of 3 percent a month, or 36 percent a year in 1952. The House committee determined that turn-over rates were running at about 2.3 percent a month, which figure was confirmed in the Senate hearings by Chairman Ramspeck. Accordingly, the House committee projected that rate for the future and justified the reduction of \$5,000,000 which was made.

Mr. President, the Civil Service Commission admits there is a great turn-over in personnel, principally because transfers seem to be allowed from one agency to another in the Government service, by means of which the employees thus making transfers are able to secure increases in their ratings and increases in their pay, whereas they would not be able to obtain such increases in ratings and in pay if they did not make the transfers.

On the floor of the House of Representatives, Representative TABER pointed out that placement activities of the Commission called for an increase of \$1,500,000, although the actual increase in number of placements was estimated at only 5,000. Accordingly, he was successful in reducing the appropriation on the floor by \$1,050,000, leaving an in-

crease of about \$500,000 for placement activities.

It is the amount of the floor cut in the House, \$1,050,000 which the committee amendment proposes to restore, and my amendment to that amendment proposes to allow only \$500,000 of that increase. Adoption of the amendment to the amendment would still leave the Commission with approximately \$1,000,000 more than it received in 1951.

I want to say a few words about the effect of carrying out the Senate's avowed intent to reduce budget estimates for personal services by 10 percent, which it expressed in its action on the Labor-Federal Security bill and in recommitting this independent offices bill after it was first reported with only a 5 percent cut. That action affects the activities of the Civil Service Commission in two ways.

First, it is going to cut down considerably the turnover in Government employment. Vacancies created by death or resignation are not going to be filled so readily. In fact, it is my contention that the 10-percent reduction in funds can be realized by failing to replace personnel in vacancies. This was the theory of the Jensen amendment, adopted in the House. The Senate has departed from that theory to impose a ceiling on expenditures for personal services. Any administrator can adopt the principle of the Jensen amendment as a means of staying within the ceiling the Senate has set.

Also, there will be fewer transfers from one agency to another. They run to at least 22,500 a year on the basis of the limited data furnished by the Commission, excluding those not reported and those who resign from Government service and later re-enter, perhaps after using up their terminal leave in one agency.

Mr. President, there appeared in the press this morning—and I mentioned this case on the floor a few weeks ago—an account of a man who was employed in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and who, while on terminal leave, sought employment with a company which was borrowing money from the RFC. From that company he received, I think, almost double the salary he had been receiving with RFC. He was still on the payroll of the Federal Government, by reason of having accumulated terminal leave.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was the man referred to dismissed from the RFC, where he had been employed?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. I take it he had resigned voluntarily in order to take this private employment.

Mr. McKELLAR. He should have resigned, and, if he did so, I commend him for it. But in the event he failed to resign, he ought to have been discharged.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree.

Mr. McKELLAR. He should have resigned, because he did a dishonest thing.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The man who has been referred to in the press within the past few days, apparently resigned, because he had an opportunity to get from the private company a salary twice that he had been receiving from the Government. I say it is no wonder that he resigned.

Mr. FERGUSON. But what the Senator from Michigan calls attention to is the fact that, while he was on terminal leave from the Federal Government, he was using his position and the office and telephone where he had been employed by the RFC, to carry on work for the private company.

Mr. CASE. I do not question that point at all.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield further to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Is it not also true that the Civil Service Commission, in addition to not having as much of a load, by reason of reductions made in appropriations, in the House under the Jensen amendment and in the Senate under the Ferguson amendment, may get some allocations from National Defense appropriations for the purpose of processing National Defense employees?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct, and many of those are not covered by the Civil Service Commission regulations.

Mr. CASE. Then certainly we ought to be able to save half the amount which the House thought it could save.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield me sufficient time that I may place the remainder of my statement in the RECORD, and may also read from the committee's report by way of answer to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MAYBANK. I hope the Senator will not ask me to yield too much time. How long will the Senator take,

Mr. FERGUSON. About half a minute.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my prepared statement be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the remainder of Mr. FERGUSON's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Transfers will be fewer because Government personnel money will be a little tighter. All this adds up to a confirmation of the House committee's lower estimate of turn-over, upon which the original cut in this appropriation was predicated.

Second, if the Senate's intent were to work out as a straight across-the-board cut of 10 percent budget estimates for personnel, we would have at least halted the trend of increased Government payrolls. I might add, however, that we would be doing no more than halt it. We would simply be holding payrolls to the 1951 level and disallowing

the increases planned for next year. Some may have thought the 10 percent reduction formula was going to do a great deal more, but unfortunately it does not. It just about allows us to stand still.

In any event the result would be to relieve the Civil Service Commission of the "greater workloads resulting from rising Federal employment" which Mr. Ramspeck used, along with increased turn-overs, as justification for the increase in funds he requested.

Information which he furnished the Senate committee shows how this works out. He reported Federal civilian employment within the continental United States on June 30 would be 2,350,000. He estimated that by June 30, 1952 it would be 2,600,000. If we apply a 10 percent cut to this 1952 figure, which roughly the Senate's actions would accomplish although our 10 percent cut has been in dollars and not in jobs, there would be taken 260,000 off the 1952 figure. That takes us back almost exactly to the current employment figure of 2,350,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should also like to read to the Senator from South Dakota from the committee report on the pending bill, this statement:

The committee also wishes to point out that 72 percent of the placements during the next fiscal year will be made by boards and committees of examiners paid for by the several agencies, whereas only 54 percent of such placements will be made by agency boards during the current fiscal year. This transfer of work to the agencies will permit additional savings in the commission's expenditures.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the subject of the RFC was brought into the argument by the Senator from Michigan, and he mentioned the case of an employee who had made an improper use of his terminal leave. No one knows better than the Senator from Michigan that I am, and always have been, opposed to employees accumulative terminal leave. The Senator knows that he and I, last year, when the subject of rent control was under consideration, voiced complaint about terminal leave. I understood that the purpose of the law was to require Federal employees to take their annual leave, not to accumulate it and make an improper use of it in getting a better job.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to answer that by saying I think that is exactly true. I think that particular agency pointed out to the subcommittee, of which we were both members, the fallacy of permitting a large amount of terminal leave to be accumulated by Federal employees.

Mr. MAYBANK. As the Senator from Michigan knows, in the latter part of the pending bill we propose an amendment to require Federal employees to take their leave at appropriate times.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Further replying to the Senator's statement, I merely wish to say that this particular item for the Civil Service Commission, as the Senator is aware, is \$4,950,000 below the Budget estimate. It is true that it is more than the House figure, but that is because the chairman and other members of the Commission appeared before us in connection with the loyalty

program, and wrote various letters and submitted various statements in connection with the enforcement of that program. In the Senate subcommittee, we increased the House figure by more than \$1,000,000. I refer to the House committee's figure. Therefore, what we have reported to the Senate is merely the figure of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for this agency, plus the full committee's report to the House. I hope, in the interest of good government, that this additional amount will not be taken from this agency of Government. As I have stated, it is already about \$3,900,000 below the President's budget.

There is no point in my reading the hearings and the records and the letter which was written by Mr. Ramspeck, or in reading the laws which were passed by the Congress.

I know the Senator from Michigan will agree with me on one thing, namely, that oftentimes Congress passes a law but makes no appropriations with which to pay those employed to enforce the law. They come before the committee and say that there is an authorization, or that because of the law with respect to loyalty proceedings, or something else, more money is required. It is incumbent on Congress, as I see it, to appropriate money with which to carry out the provisions of laws duly passed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely want to say in reply that we have attempted to get estimates as to what prospective laws are going to cost the taxpayers before the bills are passed in the Senate and in the House.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from South Carolina has been assisted in that effort by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have joined hands with the Senator, and we have introduced a bill to meet that objective.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Michigan knows that, so far as terminal leave is concerned—and I am not boasting; I merely happened to be one of those who introduced the bill—we have been trying to do something about it for 2 years. We have in the pending bill an amendment, I think, which prohibits the accumulation of terminal leave, and which provides that leave must be used from year to year. Certain amendments are legislation on an appropriation bill, but there will be amendments proposed by other Senators for the purpose of furthering the legislation which the House committee has sent to the Senate regarding terminal and other leave.

Mr. President, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Michigan will not be willing to accept my amendment "C."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield time to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MAYBANK. Is the Senator from Illinois on my side, or on the other side?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am on the other side.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, whatever side the Senator is on, I yield 2 minutes to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder whether the Senator from Michigan would not be willing to accept my amendment "C," which appropriates \$17,000,000 instead of \$17,500,000, and hence would effect an additional saving of \$500,000, and would conform to the House figure. I know it is sometimes difficult for us to agree on precise amounts in the matter of the cuts which are to be made. On the last amendment upon which there was a yea-and-nay vote, I think the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] went a little further than I was willing to go. But I wondered whether we could not get together on the suggestion I have made, and save another \$500,000 in the Civil Service Commission. This may be going further than the Senator from Michigan wants to go, but I think that agency can take the cut. It would still allow nearly \$500,000 more than was allowed last year.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, when the Senator from Illinois refers to the House figure, he, of course, refers to the cut which was made on the House floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. He does not refer to the action of the Appropriations Committee of the House or of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House, which made a lengthy study of the matter, but he refers simply to some amendment which was thrown into the House hopper during the closing hours.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The House is a deliberative body.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; but not quite so deliberative as is the Senate.

I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not agree to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. The number of employees is being increased by reason of the situation in which we find ourselves. I should like to invite attention to one group of figures. I read from page 464 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations:

Senator SALTONSTALL. This increase, Mr. Ramspeck, in this particular function comes from increasing your number of employees from 704 to 1,805, and your record check and inquiry cases from 483,000 to 1,250,000.

In other words, the work of the Commission has increased threefold. That is why we should give at least enough money properly to do its work. The amount suggested is an estimate. I believe the estimate of the Senator from Illinois is too low and that the estimate of the Senator from Michigan is more in line with the facts. The committee took the figure which the House felt was right. If we are going to have loyalty checks, Mr. President, I believe we should make them worthwhile.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, insofar as the law is concerned, the amend-

ment of the Senator from Illinois to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan is based on too low an estimate. I am not here defending the Civil Service Commission, but I am defending the laws passed by the Congress of the United States. Mr. Ramspeck was for many years a responsible Member of the House of Representatives. He stated that, because of developments, it is expected that June 30, 1951, will find the Commission with a balance of more than 650,000 cases on which it has been unable to make the loyalty check required by the laws of Congress.

I do not know whether the cost was discussed, but we are asked to appropriate money, and then when the item comes up for debate we are asked to undo the laws passed by Congress. So I am opposed to both amendments.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the information which Mr. Ramspeck furnished the Senate committee shows how the amendment would work out. He reported that on June 30, 1952, it would be 2,600,000. If we apply a 10-percent cut to this 1952 figure, which roughly the Senate's actions would accomplish, although our 10 percent cut has been in dollars and not in jobs, we would take 260,000 off the 1952 figure. That takes us back almost exactly to the current employment figure of 2,350,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the reason why the 10-percent cut is not effective is that we had already cut the agencies so much.

Mr. FERGUSON. If we apply the 10-percent cut to budget estimates for personnel we shall go back to the current employment figure of 2,350,000. That would mean maintaining the status quo rather than cutting from the number they had last year. The budget figures propose a pyramid.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan knows that we have given the Civil Service Commission additional laws to administer. We have passed laws which have placed extra burdens upon the Commission. We pass laws and then do not want to appropriate money to carry out the laws passed by the Congress. That is my sole point. The Senator cannot differ with that statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. We are giving the Commission a million dollars more than last year, and the loyalty program has been in effect.

Mr. MAYBANK. But the loyalty program requires \$3,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MON-

RONEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness, and if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate, and if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent on official business as a member of the President's Commission on the One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence, and if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate, and if present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—52

Aiken	Frear	Mundt
Bennett	Hendrickson	Nixon
Brewster	Hennings	Robertson
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Holland	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. C.
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Case	Kem	Thye
Connally	Knowland	Watkins
Douglas	Langer	Welker
Duff	Long	Wiley
Eastland	McClellan	Williams
Ecton	McMahon	Young
Ferguson	Millikin	
Flanders	Moody	

NAYS—19

Anderson	Hayden	Maybank
Benton	Hill	McFarland
Chavez	Humphrey	McKellar
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Cordon	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
George	Lehman	
Green	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—25

Capehart	Gillette	Malone
Dirksen	Hunt	Martin
Dworshak	Kefauver	McCarran
Ellender	Kerr	McCarthy
Fulbright	Lodge	Monroney

Morse
Murray
O'Connor
Pastore

Smathers
Stennis
Taft
Tobey

Underwood
Wherry

So the amendment to the committee amendment proposed by Mr. FERGUSON on behalf of himself and other Senators was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask to have my amendment lettered "O" considered at this time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Illinois a question? I have an amendment which is a limitation on travel expense of the Civil Service Commission, which logically follows the one we have just acted upon. I believe the chairman may accept it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be very glad to withhold offering my amendment temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois temporarily withholds his amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment lettered "D" for myself, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 21, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$575,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, last year's appropriation act contained a limitation on travel expense of \$438,013. With an increased appropriation of \$1,000,000 in the first supplemental appropriation bill, the limitation raised to \$466,000.

The budget estimates for 1952 carry an estimate for travel of \$499,058. Despite this estimate it was asked that the limitation for this item be raised to \$623,000. The House allowed \$520,000 and the Senate Committee has allowed \$600,000. We propose that the limitation be reduced to \$575,000, which is about \$75,000 more than was allotted by the Budget Bureau, and some \$25,000 under the Senate committee figure. It would be in line with the amendment previously adopted.

This limitation does not actually assure any saving. It is, however, a brake upon waste through excessive or unnecessary travel. If anything, we have been entirely too generous in the ceiling upon travel expense which we propose in this amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, what the Senator from New Hampshire has said is eminently correct, and I shall be glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for himself

and other Senators to the committee amendment on page 10, line 21.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is my amendment designated "6-18-51-O."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 65, line 17, after the word "leave", it is proposed to insert "of any civilian officer or employee in excess of 20 days per year or for annual leave."

On page 65, line 20, in the committee amendment, after the comma, it is proposed to insert "That after July 1, 1951, no civilian officer or employee shall be permitted to earn annual leave at a rate in excess of 20 days per year: *Provided further*."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have been advised informally that this amendment is in order from the parliamentary standpoint, because section 601 of the bill before us is already legislation upon a general appropriation bill. Section 601 not only applies to the leave provision for Government agencies covered by this appropriation, but also to all Government corporations and agencies included in this or any other act. So section 601 is already general legislation. My amendment is therefore merely an amendment to language already in the House provision, and it is my understanding that therefore, from a parliamentary standpoint, it is in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator whether the effect of this amendment is the same as the effect of his amendment he offered a few days ago to the Labor-Federal security bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is the same, with the exception that, because of the fact that section 601 does not itself refer to sick leave, I have omitted from my amendment any reference to sick leave, and have confined it purely to annual leave. Otherwise, this amendment would not be germane. It has the same purpose as the amendment I offered last week, but it is even more technically ironclad than was that amendment. It contains a prohibition that no one shall be permitted to earn annual leave at a rate in excess of 20 days a year, and provides that no money shall be paid out for leave in excess of that amount. So it affords a double protection.

Thus there are two important differences between this amendment and the one I offered to the Labor-Federal Security bill. First, this one affects all Government agencies rather than only those included in any particular appropriations bill. Second, the law is actually changed, so that fund limitations for the payment of annual leave are backed up by changes in the law itself.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. When the House bill came to the Senate, it contained the language in section 601, on page 65, lines 14 to 20. Mr. Campbell, president of the Association of Government Workers, wrote me quite a long letter, suggesting that the subcommittee amend this provision under one of two alternative plans, either plan 1 or plan 2.

We amended the House language under plan 2.

Mr. President, I ask that my remarks be charged to my time. I do not want to make a speech on the time of the Senator from Illinois. However, I wish to state the situation perfectly clearly for the RECORD.

I talked with the Senator from Illinois about the amendment at the time the Federal Security bill was before the Senate. That bill contained no legislation. This bill contains the provision "that the head of any such corporation or agency shall afford an opportunity for officers or employees to use the annual leave accumulated under the section prior to June 30, 1952."

It is my judgment, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, that this section, as it came from the House, is legislation. I would not undertake to instruct the Chair how to rule, or to suggest a ruling. I merely wish the RECORD to be clear, that in view of the fact that the provision is legislation as it came over from the House, and in view of the fact that the language was amended by the committee itself, the amendment is not subject to a point of order. I express only my own opinion. I would not presume to suggest to the Chair how he should rule.

When a similar amendment came up in connection with the Labor-Federal Security bill, as I remember, I spoke to the present occupant of the chair, and we looked at the language. When the amendment was before the appropriations subcommittee I took the liberty of saying at that time, as well as before the full committee, as the Senator from Michigan knows, that it was my opinion, after consulting with several Senators, that since the House provision itself was legislation, the amendment would not be subject to a point of order.

The Senator from Illinois has been talking with me about this subject over a considerable period of time. We have been discussing leave and other matters for about 2 years. So far as I was concerned, as chairman of the subcommittee, and speaking solely for myself, I stated that I would have no objection to accepting his amendment.

I appreciate the fact that it seeks to legislate in this bill contrary to the wishes of my good friend, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The last time, when the amendment was carried by one vote, I voted with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, because at that time I stated that I construed the amendment to be legislation on an appropriation bill. In view of the fact that I am charged with the responsibility for the bill as reported by the subcommittee, and in view of the fact that I am

in charge of the bill as reported from the full committee, I felt that I should call attention to the situation.

The House of Representatives wrote this language into the bill in no uncertain terms. While I will not stand here to defend it, I consider it to be my duty not to oppose the language which the House placed in the bill, as amended by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and as agreed to by the full committee.

That is the point which I wished to make clear. I do not want to be charged with interfering with some other committee. For that reason I opposed the Senator from Illinois when he sought to amend the Labor-Federal Security bill. The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] made an excellent speech on the subject.

This provision I consider to be legislation on an appropriation bill, but it was written into the bill by the House of Representatives. The subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations amended the language, and the full committee added a proviso, as I remember, under plan numbered 2.

I am not here to make a speech in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, but I will say to him that as a member of the subcommittee and of the full committee I cannot consistently and honorably object to his amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from South Carolina to say that he accepts the amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from South Carolina stated that he would be willing to accept it on behalf of himself, as chairman of the subcommittee. However, other Senators may wish to discuss the amendment. I merely wish to have the RECORD show what happened in the committee. I want the RECORD to show why I opposed the Senator's motion on the previous bill. I told him a week ago how I construed the language. I am merely stating my own position as chairman of the subcommittee. I will accept the amendment provided it is agreeable to the committee. I do not know what the committee desires to do. I do not know what my good friend from South Carolina, chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, intends to do. I supported him to the end on a previous occasion because I believed that at that time the Senator from Illinois was attempting to legislate on an appropriation bill, although the Chair did not so rule.

Mr. President, I ask that the time consumed by my remarks be charged to my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That arrangement will be made. The Chair advises the Senator from South Carolina that 7 minutes are now charged to his time on this amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. It would reduce from 26 working days a year to 20 days the amount of annual leave provided for virtually all employees in the Government. As I have pointed out over and over again, the present provision of 26 working days, on the basis of a 5-day

week, comes to 5½ weeks for every Government employee, except for postal workers; and if this amendment carries, I will offer an amendment to the post-office bill to give them the same amount of leave. With the provision of 15 days for sick leave—which, because of a parliamentary situation, we could not touch by this amendment—3 weeks more are added. I am merely substituting for this 5½ weeks a 4 weeks' vacation, which, with a week end, will amount to a full month.

I believe that every Member of the Senate, and virtually everyone else in the country as a whole, is convinced that 5½ weeks' annual leave a year for every classified Government employee is excessive. They should not have had it in the past, and certainly, in view of the financial stringency in which the Government is placed at present, we should not allow it to continue any longer.

Fortunately, the section inserted by the House is of such a general nature that we can now proceed to legislate, not merely for the independent offices, but for all other Government agencies.

Mr. MAYBANK. It means the amendment, as the Senator says, is general in nature.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to state again that it is legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. CASE addressed the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to finish my statement on one more point. Then I shall be glad to yield. I see the bees closing in around me. I did not say hornets; I said bees.

I believe every Senator is convinced that this step must be taken at some time. The question is when the step should be taken. I submit that now is the time, when the need for economy is very great. My amendment would save \$200,000,000. That is not something to be ignored.

I know that my good friend the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], for whom I have great admiration, is very likely to say that the subject should be left to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which he is chairman. However, I should like to point out, in all sincerity and friendliness, that his committee has had the subject before it for more than a year, and no action has been taken. In a sense, Mr. President, we are helping the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, because by fixing 20 days, or four full weeks, we are taking from the committee a great deal of pressure which would undoubtedly be brought to bear on it by every group of Government employees. If the committee does not like the provision, it is always within its power to provide for a more graduated scale based on length of service. The amendment is merely an attempt on the part of Congress to express its conviction that something should be done now. We can leave the working out of the details to the committee. If the committee believes that the leave period should be left at 26 days, it can restore the 26-day

provision, although I do not believe it is likely that the committee would take such action.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the junior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. Does the Senator from Illinois know of any private business in the United States which gives its employees a vacation of 5 weeks?

Mr. DOUGLAS. A negligible number. Less than one-half of 1 percent of all employees are granted such liberal vacations.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to commend the Senator from Illinois for the action he is taking. I believe this is the way it should be done. I am not in favor of a meat-axe cut. I believe economy should be effected in the manner now being suggested by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The adoption of the amendment would save \$200,000,000.

Mr. MOODY. Which is not a negligible sum of money.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the senior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan understands that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is in charge of the bill, is willing to take the amendment to conference. I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois would allow it to be taken to conference. The Senator from Michigan shares the views of the Senator from Illinois on the proposed cut in the number of days of leave, indeed, the Senator from Michigan had endeavored in committee to get an agreement as to what would be a reasonable amount of leave, both in connection with this bill and on the previous appropriation bill.

Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. CASE, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the committee is willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference, it will be perfectly satisfactory to me. I shall not insist on a yea-and-nay vote at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Illinois that the Senate would have to vote on his amendment regardless of whether it is accepted by the chairman. The Chair will state that the time for debate on the amendment is controlled by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], respectively.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator from New York is in favor of my amendment, I shall be glad to yield some time to him.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New York wishes to ask a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New York for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. In debate on the floor of the Senate recently I have seen it very definitely demonstrated that if the pending amendment were agreed to, there would still exist liability on the part of the Government to pay for the extra 6 days provided by law, unless the appropriate statute were simultaneously repealed or amended.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I may say to my good friend from New York that if he will look at lines 4 to 7 of my amendment and compare the language with line 20 of the bill he will see that the amendment is now in such form that no legal liability against the Government would accrue in the future. We have closed the door.

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. CASE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield further to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I would certainly question whether the amendment of the Senator from Illinois would not constitute legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend from New York that the House has already legislated in this bill. If I understand the parliamentary rules, amendments to such legislation if germane are therefore in order.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further observation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Although it is quite probable that the length of annual leave should be curtailed, I certainly do not believe this is the way to do it. The Senate has a committee which has charge of the consideration of matters affecting the employees of the Government. It would seem to me that instead of again resorting to a hit-and-miss method—and that is what we are doing virtually with every amendment that is being presented—we should proceed in an orderly way through the functions of a committee which is duly constituted by the Senate with definite powers in that regard. We have seen several instances on the floor of the Senate of amendments being adopted in a completely hit-and-miss manner.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, my affection for the Senator from New York is so great that I am very glad to have yielded him time for him to making a speech against my amendment.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Before yielding I should like to say in reply to the Senator from New York that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service could work out the details. The adoption of my amendment would be merely a declaration by the Senate that we do not believe that on the average annual leave should exceed 20 days.

I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I again wish to say to the Senator from

New York that I think it is rather unfortunate when we attempt to legislate on the floor of the Senate, but this is not an attempt to legislate on the floor of the Senate. It is merely an attempt to amend legislation which was passed by the House of Representatives in the pending bill, which was sent to the subcommittee of which I am the chairman. I had previously voted against changing the present law, but not because I thought the amount of leave should not be reduced, or that the employees of certain agencies should not have more leave, such, for example, as the employees of the Post Office Department. The amendment is not legislation, except in the sense that it proposes to change what the House has legislated.

Mr. CASE and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is controlled by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] as proponent of the amendment, and by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from South Carolina has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I shall yield whatever time the junior Senator from South Carolina wishes to take, except that I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the senior Senator from South Carolina is yielding 6 minutes to his colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and 2 minutes thereafter to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is that satisfactory to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. CASE. That is satisfactory.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, we have a rule in the Senate which provides that the Senate cannot legislate on an appropriation bill. I believe every Senator agrees that it is a good rule. Let us see what we are doing here. I shall raise a point of order to the amendment of the Senate committee, on the ground that it represents legislation upon an appropriation bill. If such be the fact, then the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to that amendment is out of order at this time. Let me read the provision of the bill:

No part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this or any other act, including the Government of the District of Columbia, shall be available to pay for annual leave accumulated by any civilian officer or employee during the calendar year 1951 and unused at the close of business on June 30, 1952.

Now let us consider the amendment voted by the Senate committee. Here is where we begin with legislation on an appropriation bill and here is where I raise the point of order. I read now the committee amendment:

Provided, That the head of any such corporation or agency shall afford an opportunity for officers or employees to use the annual leave accumulated under this section prior to June 30, 1952: *Provided further—*

Now comes the amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment. It reads as follows:

That after July 1, 1951, no civilian officer or employee shall be permitted to earn annual leave at a rate in excess of 20 days per year: *Provided further—*

Mr. President, if that is not legislation on an appropriation bill, there cannot be legislation on an appropriation bill. When we take into consideration both the committee amendment and the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment, it is clear that they constitute legislation on an appropriation bill. Therefore, I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. I make the point of order against both the committee amendment and the amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment. Certainly they are legislation on an appropriation bill. I should like to have the Chair rule on the point of order before we proceed further.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it in order to make a point of order against a committee amendment which has been adopted, namely, the committee amendment on page 65 in lines 20 to 23?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that at the time when the committee amendments were adopted, it was agreed, and was so stated in the Record, that the committee amendments would be open to future amendment, just as if they had not been agreed to on that day.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me inquire whether the right to offer amendments to the committee amendments which then were adopted would include the right to make points of order in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair believes that would be possible. The Chair would welcome expressions of opinion on that point by Members of the Senate.

However, it seems to the Chair, who has conferred with the Parliamentarian in regard to this matter, that the fact that the bill as passed by the House of Representatives contained the words, on page 65, in lines 15 and 16, "in this or any other act," makes this provision of the bill, as passed by the House, general legislation applicable not only to the agencies covered by this appropriation bill but to other agencies of the Government, likewise. That being the case, it is in order for the committee, in turn, to offer the amendment now appearing on page 65 in lines 20 to 23.

If that be true, the latter part of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois would itself be in order as an amendment to a committee amendment which is offered to wording already contained in the bill as it came from the House of Representatives; and, as the Chair has already stated, the committee amendment also would be in order.

Before making a final ruling to that effect, the Chair will be glad to be ad-

vised by Members of the Senate, if they care to argue the matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, would it be possible for me to obtain time in that connection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that under the unanimous-consent agreement there may be as much as 30 minutes of debate on the point of order, with the time to be divided equally.

The Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to confirm the interpretation given by the present occupant of the chair. As I indicated on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, when I first read section 601 of the bill, it was not apparent that it was legislation, but a second reading indicated clearly that the words "in this or any other act," as those words appear in lines 15 and 16 on page 65 of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives, are not only a limitation but are general legislation. Being general legislation which was included in the bill as passed by the House of Representatives, those words, in my opinion, then became a general provision of the bill, and therefore are subject to amendment in the Senate. The only question that remains is whether any Senate amendment to that general legislation is germane. Certainly the committee amendment appearing in lines 20 to 23 on page 65 is germane as an amendment to the general provisions of section 601.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems clear that the Chair is correct in ruling that the amendment is not subject to a point of order.

I inquired whether the adoption of that committee amendment, although subject to further amendment, would exclude the possibility of making a point of order. After the Chair's ruling that the adoption of the committee amendment at that time did not prevent in the future the making of a point of order, I still feel that the Chair is correct in his ruling that the words "in this or any other act," as those words were inserted in the bill by the House of Representatives, make this provision of the bill general legislation, and that therefore the committee amendment is in order, and that therefore the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment is also in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Michigan to raise the question of germaneness. The Chair has not ruled on that question at all. The Chair understands that if that question is raised, it will have to be submitted to the Senate itself for determination.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Presiding Officer about the allocation of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That depends on whether the Senator from South Carolina favors the point of order. If he favors the point of order, the time in opposition to the point of order will be controlled by the minority leader or by some Senator designated by him.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to make it perfectly plain, so that there will be no misunderstanding, that I do not think

the amendment is subject to a point of order, although I may be mistaken.

Therefore, I desire to yield whatever time I have to the junior Senator from South Carolina. Inasmuch as the provision referred to is in the bill as it came from the House of Representatives, I believe the committee amendment is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that he may yield control of his time on this matter to his colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask how much more time is available to the Senator from South Carolina, and how much time is available to the other side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The entire 15 minutes in opposition to the point of order are available to the Senator from South Carolina.

The time remaining to the Senator from Michigan is 11 minutes, so the Chair is advised.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is not the Senator from South Carolina speaking in favor of the point of order, and the Senator from Michigan speaking in opposition to the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Chair's ruling is simply that the Senator from South Carolina has not begun to use his time, and that 4 minutes of the time available to those opposing the validity of the point of order have been consumed.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield the time allowed to me under the unanimous-consent agreement to the junior Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE. Reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that the unanimous-consent request pertains to the question regarding the point of order, and does not affect the time previously allowed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from South Dakota that it is the understanding of the Chair, that the Senator from South Dakota will have the right to be recognized for 2 minutes upon the principal question, when the point of order shall have been disposed of.

Mr. MAYBANK. In justice to the Senator from South Dakota, I may say, before I yield the entire 15 minutes, that I shall be glad, as I feel certain my colleagues will, to yield additional time to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from South Carolina may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in regard to the saving of money for the Federal Government under this appropriation bill, when we adopt the House provision, we save money to the extent of stopping the pay of employees for certain accumulated leave. We would not be saving it if we

were to cut the annual leave to 20 days this year, next year, and the following year. Next year the Congress, if it sees fit to do so, may appropriate whatever amount it cares to in regard to leave, as it could do in this appropriation bill; but in this bill the door has been closed as to accumulation of annual leave next year, or until June 30, 1952. The Congress will have until then to adjust the matter of leave. The question will then arise, how can the greatest saving be effected?

I have in my hand a table which is the basis of the work of the subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service at the present time, and adoption of the figures there given would result in greater saving than the saving which would be effected by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois.

I desire to read from the table certain figures. I notice that the saving under the Senator's amendment would be \$140,618,430, as against \$199,765,215, as shown by the table. It will be noticed that the figures appearing on the table represent a far greater saving—and it would be brought about in a systematic way and in an equitable way—than by merely making a cut across the board.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand, then, that the Senator from South Carolina is in favor of a graduated system of leave which will reduce the total amounts of leave from 26 days?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that, as a result of discussions, the committee seems to think that that would be the logical course, instead of applying the provision equally to an employee who has been working for, say, 30 years and one who has been working only a short time. The former may need more leave than would be needed by a man serving his first year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the Senator is in favor of reducing the total amount of leave, I take it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The total amount of leave should be reduced for those in the early years of their service.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Why does not the Senator from South Carolina accept this amendment, and then later in committee propose his refinements?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I assert to the Senator from Illinois that his amendment would not save a single dime in this appropriation bill. It is nothing but a flash, so far as saving money is concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understood the Senator from South Carolina to say my amendment would save at least \$140,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The amendment which now lies on the desks of Senators would not save anything this year, not a cent. The truth of the matter is that employees who do not take leave are the ones who cost the Government money. In the case of those who take their leave, in most instances

their jobs are filled by people within the department, through a doubling-up process.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will my good friend bear with me, to permit me to ask another question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield gladly to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the total amount of leave were reduced from 26 days to 20, so that each man would work 6 days more than would otherwise be the case, does the Senator from South Carolina not feel that as a result fewer people would be employed to do the same amount of work, and would that not effect economies in the total size of the payroll?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. My understanding is that a reduction is already being made. Let me call to the attention of the Senate one other matter which should be considered for a moment. First we make a 10-percent cut, and then we cut the employees leave. When both those things are done, the result is a two-way cut. That is exactly what we would be doing to the Government workers.

So far as Government workers are concerned, I am not here to say that each of them is working at his job every minute; neither is every employee in the office of the Senator from Illinois or in my office working every minute. But I think that, as a whole, Government workers give as good service, hour in and hour out, as do employees working for corporations in carrying on their activities. So I think we should adopt a provision which would result in the older employees being shown some consideration for their service. The truth of the matter is that as a usual thing the older a person becomes, the more he needs to take leave.

I do not care to consume the time of the Senate in connection with this appropriation bill, but I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that I believe the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which has been devoting many hours to the consideration of this particular question of leave, should be given consideration, rather than what is said by some Senators on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER rose.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If there were a bill before a committee, whether it be the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Foreign Relations, or the Committee on Finance, each member of the committee would want the committee to decide what was best to be done under all the circumstances.

Let us remember that there are various kinds of leave, which the committee is studying at the present time, in an effort to determine what should be done. An amendment is now proposed to cut annual leave to 20 days, merely by an amendment to be acted upon on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I ask the distinguished Senator whether it is not true

that, if the question were before a committee, we would be confronted with a proposition which I shall cite purely as an example. We have before our committee a matter which concerns Alaska, where the weather is very cold, and where the situation is entirely different from that in Panama. Our committee found, for example, 3 years ago, that in one department 800 employees were doing absolutely nothing. They had been on the payroll a long time, and the criticism was made, "Here you have 800 employees who are doing absolutely nothing." We brought in the head of the Bureau of Mines, and we said, "How can you justify having on the payroll 800 employees who are doing nothing?" The answer was, "It is very simple. John L. Lewis may call a strike tomorrow. He is threatening from day to day, from week to week, and from month to month to call a strike. It is necessary that we have these stand-bys, so that, in case a strike is called, we shall have the people available to go in and do the job, overnight." He said, "For example, who is going to take charge of these mines if a strike occurs?" The members of the committee, including one of the Senators who today is arguing for the pending amendment, decided unanimously to extend the period of time of those 800 employees, by reason of the fact that it was winter, and it was desired to protect the American people from suffering in case a strike occurred at any time within the near future.

I ask my distinguished colleague from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, if the subcommittee and the committee itself have not spent weeks and weeks of time in working out this matter on an equitable basis, so that, as the Senator said a moment ago, those who have worked for a great many years would get more leave than those who have worked a shorter period.

I agree fully with what the distinguished chairman of the committee has said. The subject is pending before his committee, and hearings are being conducted. Therefore, I believe that the committee should not be discharged, as it were, and legislation passed on the floor without our going into the question very carefully. I compliment the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for battling not only for the rights of the committee, but for the rights of Federal employees so that they may receive a square deal.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his remarks. If we examine the appropriation bill, it will be found that some persons employed by the Federal Government receive bonuses or increased salaries because they reside in certain territories or areas, which brings out the fact that possibly those persons who live in a particular section will receive more leave than will others.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Will the Senator from South Carolina inform me whether it is

his opinion that the same problem which is before the Senate at this moment was discussed, argued, and acted upon in connection with a similar amendment last week?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It was.

Mr. WELKER. Does the Senator remember the very learned and able address of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], when he told his colleagues that it was an attempt at general legislation on an appropriation bill and was, therefore, not in order?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I recall the address, and the Senator from Georgia was correct.

Mr. WELKER. Is it not a further fact that in the event this amendment is adopted claim after claim will be presented to the Treasury of the United States to pay for the administration of the amendment, and that no good lawyer upon the floor of the Senate can tell the real legality of the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think the Senator is entirely correct. There is no Senator who will not agree that this amendment is legislation attached to an appropriation bill. The fact that it started in the House and the amendment is offered in the Senate makes no difference. It is still wrong legislation.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the able Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I was attending a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations this morning and could not be present at the meeting of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Did the committee report a bill on this subject?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The bill is before a subcommittee at the present time, which is now considering it. The Senate is asked to take it out of the hands of the subcommittee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It seemed to me that the plan which the subcommittee had worked out was a very excellent plan.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Tennessee was present when we discussed the same question in the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I think that practically every member of the committee agreed that an excellent piece of work had been done and that the present head of the Civil Service Commission had made an excellent record on this subject. Yet, Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois brings up the question of limiting the annual leave to 20 days and doing nothing with reference to sick leave. Why did he not make the number of days 19, or 21? How did he arrive at the provision for 20 days? That is the length of leave received by the Post Office Department employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The Chair is ready to rule, unless there be further discussion.

After conferring with the Parliamentarian, the Chair rules that the inclusion of the words "in this or any other act," in section 601 of the pending bill as it

came from the House of Representatives, constitutes general legislation, and in view of that fact, amendments, whether they be committee amendments or amendments offered from the floor, which are germane or relevant to the subject matter, are in order.

The Chair rules, therefore, that the point of order is not well taken, and that the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois is in order.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment, I think, is one as to which there is general agreement. I myself have a bill pending before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service which proposes during the national emergency to reduce the leave of employees from 26 to 15 days, the amount which postal employees have. So I am in favor of the objective. But there are two questions with respect to the language, concerning which I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Illinois. First, the effect of inserting the first amendment, starting in line 14, would be to make it read, "shall be available to pay for annual leave of any civilian officer or employee in excess of 20 days per year or for annual leave."

The question I raise is whether that would seek to confiscate leave in excess of 20 days. I fear that it would open the Government to claims of civil-service employees who have accrued leave in excess of 20 days, and that no appropriation would be available for the 6 days. It seems to me it should be made applicable to the existing fiscal year. I would suggest that instead of the words "per year" we use the words "for the fiscal year 1952."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, that is perfectly acceptable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is modified accordingly.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the second question related to the use of the words "permitted to earn" in line 6 of the suggested amendment. If "permitted to earn" means permitted to accrue, that is one meaning, but I think the intent of the Senator from Illinois is to go to the matter of entitlement. I think the present law entitles a civil-service employee to have annual leave of 26 days, except as to postal employees. I would suggest that instead of using the words "permitted to earn" the words be "entitled to earn."

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be very happy to accept that modification also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is modified accordingly.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Illinois. The problem is a very difficult one.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator for his suggestions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	McMahon
Anderson	Green	Millikin
Bennett	Hayden	Monroney
Benton	Hendrickson	Moody
Brewster	Hennings	McKellar
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Humphrey	Pastore
Cain	Ives	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Dirksen	Langer	Taft
Douglas	Lehman	Thye
Dworshak	Long	Watkins
Eastland	Magnuson	Welker
Ecton	Maybank	Wiley
Ellender	McCarran	Williams
Ferguson	McCarthy	Young
Flanders	McClellan	
Frear	McFarland	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], as modified. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been asked for. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 65, line 17, after "leave" insert the following "of any civilian officer or employee in excess of 20 days for the fiscal year 1952 or for annual leave."

On page 65, line 20, after the comma, insert the following: "That after July 1, 1951, no civilian officer or employee shall be entitled to earn annual leave at a rate in excess of 20 days per year: *Provided further.*"

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea", and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate, and, if present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent on official business as a Member of the President's Commission on the One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence, and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] who is absent by leave of the Senate is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent because of illness, and if present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—52

Bennett	Ferguson	Millikin
Benton	Flanders	Monroney
Brewster	Frear	Moody
Bricker	George	Mundt
Bridges	Green	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Hendrickson	Robertson
Byrd	Hennings	Russell
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Case	Hill	Smith, Maine
Clements	Hoey	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Holland	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Jenner	Sparkman
Dirksen	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Douglas	Kem	Wiley
Dworshak	Long	Williams
Eastland	Maybank	Young
Ecton	McClellan	
Ellender	McMahon	

NAYS—26

Aiken	Johnson, Tex.	McFarland
Anderson	Johnston, S. C.	McKellar
Butler, Md.	Kilgore	Neely
Cain	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Langer	Schoeppel
Chavez	Lehman	Thye
Hayden	Magnuson	Watkins
Humphrey	McCarran	Welker
Ives	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—18

Duff	Lodge	Pastore
Fulbright	Malone	Smathers
Gillette	Martin	Stennis
Hunt	Morse	Tobey
Kefauver	Murray	Underwood
Kerr	O'Connor	Wherry

So the amendment offered by Mr. DOUGLAS, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). All time on the committee amendment has expired. Without objection, the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

RENOVATION AND REPAIR OF WHITE HOUSE

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, preceding an amendment which I desire to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The communication was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 19, 1951.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

Sir: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of \$225,000 for the General Services Administration.

The details of this proposed appropriation, the necessity therefor, and the reasons for its submission at this time are set forth in the attached letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The message will be referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22, after line 25, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

Renovation and modernization, Executive Mansion: For an additional amount for "Renovation and modernization, Executive mansion," \$225,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, the Director of the Budget writes:

These funds are necessary to meet unforeseen expenses arising out of the advance in construction costs between April 1, 1949, when the original estimate of costs was prepared, and the time the various elements of the renovation and modernization project were actually committed for contract. The work to be performed with funds contained in this estimate has been reviewed and concurred in by the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion.

If Senators will bear with me for a moment I should like to explain the amendment. The entire appropriation for the purpose of renovating the White House was in the amount of nearly \$6,000,000. Prices have gone up tremendously since the work was first undertaken. It seems to me that in the light of all circumstances the President and the Director of the Budget are making a very reasonable request. I have talked with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] who is in charge of the bill, and I have talked also with the majority leader and the minority leader. They have substantially endorsed the amendment. However, the Senator from Michigan has made a proposal, which I am perfectly willing to accept. He would like to reduce the amount by \$50,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MCKELLAR. So as to reduce the amount requested to \$175,000. I believe it is a very reasonable request on his part. I, therefore, ask that the amendment be adopted, as modified. I believe we all realize that the work must be completed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to make an explanation of the item.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not mind agreeing with the Senator from Michigan. However, it would seem to me to be rather inconsistent to have the Bureau of the Budget and the President write to Congress; to have us agree with them; to have the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] tell us that the amount requested is necessary in order to finish the renovation of the Executive Mansion—and we all agree that the work should be completed—and then to be asked to agree with the Senator from Michigan that we must cut the amount requested by \$50,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan would like to state the reason for the proposed cut.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I would like to see the work completed. I would like to agree with my good friend from Tennessee. I believe he is correct. I believe the work should be finished. If \$225,000 is required that is the amount that should be appropriated. If \$200,000 is required, \$175,000 will not be sufficient.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to make an explanation on that point. I should like to explain why I propose to cut \$50,000 from the \$225,000. It is based on an examination of the details involved in the completion of the White House. In the items submitted there is included one which is in effect a contingency amount of eighty-nine-thousand-and-some-odd dollars. As a matter of fact there is another \$10,000 in reserve, or a total of about \$100,000. Something like \$89,000 of that contingency reserve would be replaced if the whole amount of \$225,000 which is requested were granted. Therefore if we were to reduce the amount by \$50,000 there would still be in the contingency fund approximately \$50,000, which would enable the Commission to take care of any small items that might arise. And if we deduct \$50,000 from the \$225,000 requested there remains \$175,000. The \$175,000 would cover every item of dollar expenditures required to complete the construction of the building. I feel as the Senator from Tennessee feels, that if we are going to spend \$5,600,000 to build the White House—

Mr. MCKELLAR. It is practically \$6,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. It is almost completed. There are such matters as the installation and adjustment of chandeliers and some venetian blinds still to be provided for, I believe. At any rate, I certainly believe that we should finish the work on the mansion for the President. However, that can be done even if the item of \$50,000 is taken out because it is only a contingent item. Does that explain the situation to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It explains it, but I am not satisfied with the explanation. I think we should appropriate the entire amount.

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope the Senator will not insist on replacing \$50,000 in the reserve for contingencies because even after we take \$50,000 away there will still be \$50,000 remaining for such unanticipated expenses.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Under the agreement there would be sufficient funds provided to pay for materials and work to finish the White House. The sum of \$89,000 is purely a contingent fund. It could be brought up in a deficiency bill at any time if the expense were actually incurred.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is the Senator from Tennessee satisfied that \$175,000 will be sufficient to complete the White House?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I think so, but I am not absolutely certain.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what I have in mind.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Estimates are the best we can get at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Inasmuch as estimates are being made and the present estimate is for \$225,000, why can we not appropriate \$225,000?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I should like to do so, but there is opposition.

Mr. FERGUSON. Under my proposed modification of the amendment sufficient funds would be provided to complete the building, except for the contingency fund, for which we would provide \$50,000.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I hope we can have a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee modify his amendment by deducting \$50,000, so as to make the amount read \$175,000?

Mr. MCKELLAR. The amount is to be reduced to \$175,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. The amount of \$225,000 is to be reduced by \$50,000, making it \$175,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I shall be happy—because it must be done—to accept the amendment.

I rise to ask how much time remains, because I have assured another Senator that he will be able to have 3 minutes of the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has 15 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to read to the Senate the language of the modified amendment of the Senator from Tennessee:

Renovation and modernization, Executive Mansion: For an additional amount for "Renovation and modernization, Executive Mansion," \$175,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. President, the Bureau of the Budget and the President both said that for this purpose \$225,000 would be needed. The amendment as originally submitted was prepared in accordance with their letters or requests.

However, as a result of the compromise reached with the Senator from Michigan, the amendment now has been modified so as to provide \$50,000 less, or \$175,000,

for renovation of the Executive Mansion. I wish to point out that both the Bureau of the Budget and the President requested the larger amount, namely, \$225,000. I simply wish to have the Senate know what it is doing when it acts on the modified amendment. When we act on the modified amendment, we are not acting on the request of the Bureau of the Budget or the request of the President, but we are acting on an amendment which was submitted on the floor of the Senate, by which the amount requested by the President and the Bureau of the Budget—namely, \$225,000—would be cut \$50,000, to \$175,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have not suggested the reduction. However, I wish to say that I understand that the request for this item is an additional request on which no hearing was held. When the chairman of the committee asked me whether I would agree to take the amendment to conference, I simply said I would agree to do so. I did not agree to do anything else.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] as modified.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from South Carolina has agreed to yield 3 minutes to me.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes, Mr. President; I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably 1,736 nominations in the Army, Navy, and Air Force; and, in order to avoid the printing of the nominations in the Executive Calendar, I wish to ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nominations be confirmed and the President be notified.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I object. We should not go into executive session at this time.

Mr. CAIN. My request is that the nominations be confirmed as in executive session. These are routine nominations in the Army, Navy, and Air Force; and they are unanimously reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have no objection to having the nominations confirmed, but I do not think we should go into executive session at this time, in view of the unanimous-consent agreement. Certainly it will be proper to have the nominations brought up later in the day.

So, with all respect to the Senator from Washington, I think it would be a mistake for the Senate to act on the nominations at this time, but of course I would have no objection to having the nominations confirmed toward the end of today's session.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I thoroughly understand the position of the Senator from South Carolina, and I shall report the nominations toward the end of the session today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment of the Senator from Tennessee, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

On page 22, after line 25, insert:

"Renovation and modernization, Executive Mansion: For an additional amount for 'Renovation and modernization, Executive Mansion,' \$175,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I submit, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], an amendment to the committee amendment on page 24, in line 1; and I ask that the amendment to the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 24, in line 1, it is proposed to strike out "\$16,426,000" and insert "\$15,000,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this item relates to the General Services Administration expenses, general supply fund. It is the overhead item for operation of the general supply fund through which the General Services Administration makes purchases for use of the various Government agencies. Some time ago the Senate and the House decided—and it is now the law—that purchases for the various Government agencies should be made by the General Services Administration, rather than by the various agencies themselves. Therefore we now have before us this item.

There is no real basis for comparing present costs with past costs, for two reasons: First, in the past indirect costs were appropriated for under operating expenses of the General Services Administration, and direct costs were financed from surcharges paid to the General Services Administration by the purchasing agencies. Second, there has been a great increase in the volume of business to be done in 1952—an increase from approximately \$92,000,000 to approximately \$150,000,000.

The Budget request was for \$18,426,000. The House allowed \$15,000,000. That is the amount proposed to be allowed by this amendment to the committee amendment, although the Senate committee recommended, by its amendment, the amount of \$16,426,000. In other words, Mr. President, our amendment to the committee amendment proposes a reduction of \$1,426,000 in the appropriation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The amendment the Senator from Michigan now proposes is the same as an amendment which was offered on the floor of the House of Representatives, is it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And the amount voted for this item by the Senate committee is the same as the amount which the House Appropriations Committee recommended, is it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is.

Mr. President, aside from storage facilities this item relates to the handling of stores sales which may amount to \$88,000,000 in volume. For handling expenses or overhead the bill in its present form would allow \$8,700,000, or a handling charge of 9.9 percent of those sales.

There are also direct deliveries of supplies amounting to \$61,600,000. The bill would allow 1.25 percent of the dollar volume of direct deliveries as a handling expense.

The total sales amount to \$149,600,000, and the bill as it is before us would allow \$9,500,000 to the General Services Administration as expenses in connection with the total sales—in other words, the business of making the purchases and distributions. That allowance for expenses amounts to 6.35 percent of the total sales.

Also included in the requests are funds for rent and space maintenance amounting to \$2,805,200, and for new warehousing facilities amounting to \$4,061,200. Both of those items could bear reduction and any reductions would make more money available for handling expenses. But even including them, we arrive at the real point of the reduction desired.

The proposed overhead cost for handling this program is 8.3 percent on store sales and 1.25 percent on direct deliveries, for an average of 5.41 percent, as compared with 6.35 percent which is in the bill.

Now let me emphasize again that those are pure handling costs, because rents, utilities, and the usual costs of doing business are taken care of otherwise. Here is a place where Government must prove its ability to do a businesslike job economically, and we propose by appropriating no more than the \$15,000,000 for this operation, that the agency should be required to cut down its handling costs.

Mr. President, this is a business which can be compared to ordinary business outside Government. It is not at all one of the intangibles, where we are enforcing regulations, or any such thing. This item simply involves the centralized purchase and handling of material and supplies for the various agencies of Government.

For the operation of this business we propose an allowance of 5.41 percent on the dollar volume handled. That is exclusive of the usual overhead costs chargeable to private business, and I am entirely confident that private business could and would operate on such an operating allowance. For that reason I think the Government agency doing this business should. I hope that the Senate will see fit to vote favorably upon this proposed cut, which is \$1,426,000 below the committee recommendation but in accordance with what the House allowed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senate committee adopted the House committee figure, after going into lengthy hearings with the General Services Administration, General Larson, and others.

I should like to call the following quotation to the attention of the Senate:

Although this is a new appropriation item for 1952, the functions, activities, workload,

unit costs, staffing and other elements which are utilized to formulate the estimate are not new. The fundamental difference between the operations to be financed in 1952 is the volume of business to be done and in nonrecurring preparatory work for taking care of the increased volume of business.

I might comment in that connection that there has been an increase of Government activities, under the Reorganization Act, with respect to buildings turned over to the General Services Administration during the past year.

I read from page 696 of the hearings on the pending bill:

The increase in volume of business is best expressed in terms of stores sales which show an increase from \$35,000,000 in 1951 to \$88,000,000 in 1952, or 151 percent. As compared to this 151-percent increase in sales, the cost of doing business on a comparable basis is increased only 77 percent.

In other words, the increase in cost was half of the business.

The budget for 1952 presented a balanced program for expanding the business under the general supply fund from \$35,000,000 in 1951 to \$88,000,000 in 1952. The reduction indicated by the House committee distributed between activities shown in the report would result in such an unbalanced program as to defeat, or at least defer until 1953, the purpose of the Congress in providing \$34,000,000 increase in the capital of the general supply fund to increase the inventory and to increase sales of common-use items to Government agencies.

Reference was made to a law similar to the laws of which I spoke previously, which the Congress passed under the Reorganization Act, setting this sales activity up. For the first time it is included this year in an appropriation bill. We finally reached the conclusion that we would go along with the original recommendation of the House committee, and not with what the Senator from Michigan has recommended, which is the same as the amount adopted by the House after the recommendation of the committee was cut on the House floor. With due deference to them, most of the Members of the House had not sat in committee when the hearings were conducted, and therefore were not familiar with what the House committee had done and the reasons for their action.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope that this amendment of the Senator from Michigan will not be adopted. I do not think it would result in economy. I believe it approaches the subject in the wrong way. The increased expenses of the General Services Administration are based on the Hoover Commission report. Under that report the sales to the various departments of the Government would be centralized in one department. The General Services Administration estimated the need for the fiscal year 1952 would amount to \$18,426,000 of which \$15,781,000 would be due to new legislation passed by Congress.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has referred to the so-called reorganization

acts. The provision under consideration gives effect to bills reported by the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which became Public Laws 152 and 754, Eighty-first Congress. We are endeavoring to provide the appropriations required under laws passed by the Congress. I wanted the RECORD to show that. As the Senator has so ably said, it was one of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator. The General Services Administration requested \$18,426,000, of which \$15,700,000 was necessary because of the new legislation. The House committee cut the amount to \$16,426,000, and, on the floor of the House, it was cut to \$15,000,000. The amendment of the Senator from Michigan would reduce the appropriation to the figure to which it was cut in the House, whereas the Senate committee put it back to the House committee figure of \$16,426,000.

Why is this money needed? The store sales, plus the goods which are stored, amounted in 1950 to \$26,000,000; in 1951, to \$35,000,000; and in 1952 they are estimated at \$88,000,000. The direct delivery sales were \$51,000,000 in 1950, \$56,000,000 in 1951, and estimated to be \$61,000,000 in 1952.

The purpose of providing for store sales is to enable the agencies to buy in bulk and then to store in warehouses. The money proposed to be appropriated is needed to enable the agency to place in warehouses the goods bought in the so-called store sales. If the money is not allowed for the warehouses, then it is impossible to have the store sales; and if we make this further cut, which will be a total cut of more than \$3,000,000 in the amount estimated, the consequence will be that we shall simply be unable to carry out the purposes of the Hoover Commission, because of the impossibility of buying goods in advance, as a result of having no place in which to store them. That is my understanding of the reason for the appropriation.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has most ably elucidated the point about which I was going to ask him a question. I might add, however, that they are all put into one group, rather than being scattered helter-skelter. That is what the Hoover Commission and the Senate committee recommended. We have appropriated sufficient funds after we have cut \$3,000,000 from the original estimate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I might make one more statement. The floor amendment in the House of Representatives reduced the amount to \$15,000,000. Representative WILLIAMS, who argued the question, compared store sales with the percentage of costs, but he failed to take into account the fact that the expense of the store sales would gradually decline from 19 percent to 12 percent, providing there were a place in which to store the goods. Gradually the expense of carrying on the store sales will decline and we can get the original warehouse cost out of the way. That is what I understand to be the purpose of the appropriation.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is the purpose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope, therefore, Mr. President, that the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan will not be adopted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire how much time I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Texas in the chair). The Senator has 10 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the sponsors of this amendment realize what the Hoover Commission recommended. All the sponsors of the amendment are endeavoring to do is to ensure efficient and economical operation, which was what the Hoover Commission most certainly intended. We realize that it is claimed that the agencies will purchase \$150,000,000 worth of supplies instead of \$92,000,000 worth. That is, incidentally, one of the things wrong with the budget. We are supplying to various agencies \$150,000,000 instead of \$92,000,000. This amendment does not cut down those amounts, but as I understand, the Senate and the Appropriations Committee have been seeking to cut down the amount of the budget. To the extent they are successful that volume of purchasing supplies will be reduced and the need for overhead funds or handling charges reduced also.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not want to predict what the Senator from Michigan will say in his argument, but the Senator knows that the products which the Government buys have materially increased in price during the past year. That applies to typewriters and everything else the Government has to buy. It has to buy from private concerns.

Mr. FERGUSON. But I am contending that it does not cost any more to handle the purchase of a \$100 typewriter than a \$50 typewriter. That makes my argument that pyramiding costs of supplies should not make pyramiding costs of overhead. It should not take a correspondingly greater number of employees to do the work.

Mr. President, if there is any cut in the bill that is justified, it is the one in connection with purchasing. I hope we shall not go back to the conditions such as the Truman committee found during the Second World War, with warehouses full of saddles designed for use in the First World War, and full of parts of wagons intended for use in the War Between the States.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was up to the Senate of the United States to turn down the Hoover reorganization recommendations if it did not agree with them. The general supply office and other agencies of Government have been scattered all over the country. Furthermore, some of the Government agencies never went to any central depot to buy goods. They bought wherever they chose.

Mr. FERGUSON. I know that and I supported the Hoover Commission recommendation. I am only saying that I want a businesslike administration of

Government agencies. It is that for which the Senator from Michigan voted when the GSA was set up, and he is now one of the sponsors of legislation to put into effect all the other Hoover Commission recommendations.

There should be a businesslike administration. The House, after due consideration, voted for \$15,000,000, and I think the Senate will be wise in cutting the amount to that figure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina will yield me time—

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. But first let me say that the House never had a record vote with reference to this appropriation.

Mr. FERGUSON. On the side-slip on page 47, it is stated that the amendment by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi was agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes, but there was no yea-and-nay vote. The amendment was just accepted by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. In effect, then, it was accepted by the House unanimously.

Mr. MAYBANK. I would not question the Senator from Michigan, but I had understood that there was no yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. FERGUSON. But the action taken was indicative of what the House wanted to do. The chairman of the subcommittee consented to the cut.

Mr. MAYBANK. I think it was thought it would be taken to conference, if I may say so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall not continue the discussion except to point out that the appropriations for 1950 and 1951 did not include rent for additional space in warehouses in order to make the contemplated sales possible. I understand the whole theory of authorizing store sales is to make it possible to be able to buy in sufficient bulk to supply the needs of more than one department at a time. If there is no place in which to store goods, that cannot be done.

I argue most sincerely that the idea of the Hoover Commission is to cut down the overhead expenses of Government, but we shall not bring about that result unless the Government agencies can buy goods as cheaply as possible, from such stores as Sears, Roebuck, Montgomery Ward, and other department stores which have storage space.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there is included in the amount of \$15,000,000 the sum of \$4,061,800 for warehousing. We are not asking to have the warehousing appropriation cut down, although I have suggested that possibility if it is not absolutely essential storage space that is to be provided.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, we have already cut \$2,000,000 from that amount. It was requested by the Bureau of the Budget. Instead of \$4,000,000, it is \$2,000,000, and my argument applies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	George	McKellar
Anderson	Green	McMahon
Bennett	Hayden	Millikin
Benton	Hendrickson	Monroney
Brewster	Hennings	Moody
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	O'Connor
Byrd	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Ives	Pastore
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Clements	Kem	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Langer	Taft
Douglas	Lehman	Thye
Duff	Long	Watkins
Dworschak	Magnuson	Welker
Eastland	Maybank	Wiley
Ecton	McCarran	Williams
Ellender	McCarthy	Young
Ferguson	McClellan	
Frear	McFarland	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and other Senators, in the committee amendment, on page 24, line 1, to strike out "\$16,426,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$15,000,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. On that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent on official business as a Member of the President's Commission on the One Hundred Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence, and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] who is absent by leave of the Senate is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], who is absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent because of illness, and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—49

Bennett	Frear	Moody
Brewster	George	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Nixon
Bridges	Hickenlooper	O'Connor
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Robertson
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Schoeppel
Byrd	Ives	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. C.
Case	Kem	Taft
Dirksen	Knowland	Watkins
Douglas	Langer	Welker
Duff	Lehman	Wiley
Dworschak	McCarthy	Williams
Eastland	McClellan	Young
Ecton	McMahon	
Ferguson	Millikin	

NAYS—27

Alken	Hayden	McCarran
Anderson	Hennings	McFarland
Benton	Hill	McKellar
Chavez	Humphrey	Monroney
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Connally	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Long	Pastore
Ellender	Magnuson	Saltonstall
Green	Maybank	Thye

NOT VOTING—20

Cain	Kerr	Smathers
Flanders	Lodge	Sparkman
Fulbright	Malone	Stennis
Gillette	Martin	Tobey
Hunt	Morse	Underwood
Johnston, S. C.	Murray	Wherry
Kefauver	Russell	

So the amendment offered by Mr. FERGUSON for himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment, was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Senate has been making some reductions. Now I shall offer two small amendments in an effort to increase certain appropriations in the bill. I have been voting with economy-minded Senators almost straight down the line; but we have now reached an appropriation which I think, in the interest of the country and in the interest of the national defense, should be increased. I refer to the safety sections of the Interstate Commerce Commission appropriations.

The other day I voted for the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, making an across-the-board percentage cut. It is difficult to justify an across-the-board cut when we reach certain items. I know it is said that we want to cut everything except the things in which we are directly interested. That does not happen to be the case

with respect to the amendments which I am offering today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that the Senator offer his amendment. He has only 15 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Very well. The time can be charged to me.

The first amendment which I shall offer is to strike out the Senate committee amendment on page 30, line 1, thus restoring the item of \$706,600 as passed by the House. The item covers the inspection of locomotives.

Mr. President, I believe that railroad transportation is as much a part of national defense as is the purchase of a cannon, a tank, or any other kind of weapon used in warfare. Railroad transportation is an absolute necessity in carrying on any kind of national defense.

We know that trains have been speeded up. We know that the railroads have been called upon to exert every possible effort to improve the transportation of freight and passengers. We are dealing with a proposed increase of \$44,080. That is pretty small potatoes, measured by the amounts of appropriations which have been granted for national defense.

We are transporting soldiers across the country. We are transporting supplies for them. It does not seem to me that it is sensible to attempt to effect an economy in such an item as this.

I wonder how many Members of the Senate have ever seen a bad railroad wreck. I have had the misfortune to see three very serious railroad wrecks, in one of which a dozen or more passengers were burned to death. I have seen 20 or 30 derailments, in which freight was strewn across the right-of-way. There is nothing much worse than a railroad wreck.

I do not know whether restoring \$44,080 in this appropriation would save us from a wreck, or whether, if the amount were not restored, such action would cause a wreck. However, I am very sure that we are going to have wrecks. We are going to have very bad wrecks. Such wrecks will kill many GI's. They will destroy a great deal of property and many weapons of war. I have the feeling that if the Senate votes not to restore this appropriation, someone will be unkind enough to say that had the appropriation been restored the wreck would not have occurred. Perhaps it would not.

The number of inspectors has been cut to the very limit. Congress, in its wisdom, determined the number of engine inspectors for the country. It seems to me that we would be going against the judgment of Congress if we were to cut the appropriations and thus reduce the number of locomotive inspectors. I sincerely hope the committee will accept my amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I regret that my good friend from Colorado voted for the 10-percent cut in personnel, which affected also the Interstate Commerce Commission. I believe his amendment should be agreed to, and I shall vote for it. I regret that he does not make the amount more than \$44,000. There is

nothing to be gained by cutting the appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission, as can be seen from the letter written to the committee by Commissioner J. Monroe Johnson, which I have had printed in the RECORD. My suggestion would be that the Senator raise his figure of \$44,000 to \$100,000, in the interest of economy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator will permit me to say so, I am offering two amendments. One of them is for \$44,000, which would cover locomotive inspections. The other amendment is for the sum of \$67,000, which would cover the maintenance and inspection of automatic signals.

Mr. MAYBANK. The amount of money to be appropriated for the Interstate Commerce Commission should be what was originally reported to the Senate by the Appropriations Committee, including the restoration of the 10-percent cut which was voted. That would be the fair thing to do. It should be done to protect the railroads. It would be the fair thing to do to protect the transportation of our country. I hope the Senator will modify his amendment and that we will have a yea-and-nay vote on it. I am not in favor of taking half-way measures.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be happy to yield if I have some time remaining.

Mr. MAYBANK. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not intend to take his time. People have come from all over the United States to testify before the subcommittee. I believe the distinguished Senator from Minnesota was present.

Mr. President, I ask that the time I have used be charged to my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the agreement the Senator from South Carolina would not have any time in his control, because he is supporting the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. No; I am supporting the original appropriation as made by the Senate committee. I am supporting the entire amount.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is the Johnson amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I beg the Chair's pardon.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I shall be happy to yield, but first I yield to the Senator from Minnesota. I yield to him very briefly.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I know it is very unpopular to support an increase in an appropriation. However, those of us who heard the testimony and became familiar with all the facts involved know that with present demands upon our railroads, they must be kept in a condition to transport every ton of freight that is necessary to be transported.

Mr. President, I suggest that one wreck on our railroads would cost more in money than the amount of the appropriation involved. There would not only be an interference with transportation, but the lives of people would be endangered. A failure to provide adequate ap-

propriations would endanger not only the lives of the passengers on trains, but of the crews who operate the trains.

In these days, when we have such an increase in freight movements, I cannot see any economy in reducing an appropriation item and thereby curtail the required number of locomotive inspectors and of others engaged in safety work on our railroads.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time for debate on the pending amendment is equally divided. The proponent of the amendment is entitled to 15 minutes, and a Senator opposing the amendment is entitled to 15 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am opposing it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as I have already stated, I have two amendments. One of them is on page 29, line 18, to restore the figure \$983,000. The other amendment is on page 30, to restore the original amount of \$706,600. They are the amounts which the House voted. If I may, I should like to consolidate my amendments into one amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent the Senator may offer them together.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be happy to yield if I have some time remaining.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that although I am in favor of his amendments, both of them are limited by the amendment with respect to personal services, and I would suggest to the Senator from Colorado that the amounts in his amendments be increased proportionately.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will yield, I should like to say that what the Senator from Massachusetts has said suggests the only reason why I opposed the amendment. The proposal of the Senator from Colorado is to add money without providing a sufficient number of men to carry on the work. It was my thought that the 10 per cent cut, from which the Senate exempted some agencies, such as the Atomic Energy Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board, should also not apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission. I am in further agreement with the Senator's suggestion that the amount be raised to over \$100,000. I believe he should restore the cut that was made in the item for personal services.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to perfect my amendment. The first part of the amendment is on page 29, line 18, to restore the figure "\$983,000"; to strike out the figure "\$922,575"; and on line 19 to strike out "\$696,800", and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$743,000."

The second part is on page 30, line 1, to restore the figure "\$706,600" and strike out the figure "\$662,520"; and on line 2.

to strike out the figure "\$508,300" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$540,000."

The amendments would restore the appropriations as originally provided for the employment of personnel in almost exact proportion to the amounts which were provided by the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment, as modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. The first part of the amendment is in the amendment of the committee on page 29, line 18, to strike out "\$922,577" and insert "\$983,000," and on line 19 to strike out "\$696,800" and insert "\$743,700."

The second part of the amendment is in the committee amendment on page 30, line 1, to strike out "\$662,520" and insert "\$706,600," and on line 2 to strike out "\$508,300" and insert "\$540,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I inquire whether the amendment is in order. Is it not an amendment in the third degree?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is in the second degree. It is an amendment to a committee amendment, which has not been agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time for debate is divided between the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield my time to any Senator who desires to oppose the amendment. I have no intention to oppose the amendment as modified. The only reason why I opposed it originally, as I stated previously, was that the personal services provision should have been restored. That has been done. I am in favor of the amendment. I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 12 minutes, or as much of the 12 minutes as he desires to take.

Mr. FERGUSON. With respect to the Bureau of Railroad Safety, I have been trying to ascertain the number who would actually be employed in the inspection department of this particular agency. I believe there are 95 inspectors out of a personnel force of 131. However, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to what I understand to be the fact that there are seven vacancies in the Bureau at the present time, although funds were appropriated for those positions last year. Funds for them have naturally been requested again for 1952. We must also bear in mind that these percentage cuts are made against budget requests, rather than against the number on the payroll this year.

The Bureau gets credit automatically for those vacancies if they are not filled. The average salary in the Bureau is

\$5,894. That means that a credit of possibly \$40,000 will automatically be applied against the cut made in the budget estimates. At that point the Bureau will be left with the work force which now is on the job. Any further reductions would have to be absorbed in other ways, but particularly in administration.

Of course, Mr. President, we realize that when we propose cuts in the funds for the administration of a particular agency, representatives of the agency are always inclined to say to Congress that the result will be a reduction in some vital part of the work of the agency, rather than in the number of clerical positions or in the amount of overhead.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. When we deal with work in the field of safety, I must say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that the question is not what one person may do when he makes inspections in the field, but the question is what he may be able to accomplish in the way of education among those who work in the shops—for instance, education of the section crews or the engineers or the brakemen or the conductors or the switchmen. The inspector must do educational work with them, in order to teach them how to assure safety in the operations of the railroad or in the operations of the division or the shop.

The great safety record made in the United States in its industrial plants, and elsewhere, has been achieved as a result of educational work, rather than work by the individual inspectors in the field.

If a reduction were made in the number of persons who engage in the safety work, there would be a decrease in the results achieved in the field in terms of reducing accidents and reducing the resultant losses.

So, as a colleague and as a fellow member of the Appropriations Committee, I say to the Senator that I regret exceedingly that I cannot agree with him. I understand that he is entirely sincere in attempting to bring about economy in Government, and of course his purpose is most laudable. Nevertheless, in this particular case I am afraid that if the personnel are reduced, there will be a decrease in the educational work in connection with the attempt to minimize the losses occurring on the railroads.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, we appreciate the sincerity of those who are pleading for a high standard of railway safety inspection. We do not wish to injure or curtail that inspection. However, it cannot be contended with correctness that this program is an educational one. These men make spot checks in the shops. The superintendents and others in the shops are the skilled men in the field, and they are the ones who do the real work. This item relates to inspections to see whether the work is done, rather than to an educational program.

I hope that those on the other side, who contend that we are in error, will appreciate, in turn, the sincerity of our efforts to reduce the staggering load of the Federal budget. I am sure the

amount of the reduction now proposed can be absorbed in the overhead and in the general operations, rather than by making a reduction in the number of inspectors.

Mr. President, we have previously had an example of this situation. Some time ago when we said we would make a reduction in the appropriations for the Customs Service, the officials of that Service said that if the cut were made, they would have to reduce the number of men engaged in the patrol work, which of course is the vital part of the Customs Service; and of course an argument based on that claim has a real appeal to the Members of Congress.

Similarly, in this case, the officials claim that the cut we propose will cause a reduction in the number of inspectors, rather than in the overhead. However, we believe that all of the proposed reduction can be absorbed in the overhead, without doing harm to a program which has unquestioned value.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I rise to a point of information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to address this inquiry to the Senator from Michigan, who is the author of the 10-percent reduction amendment, which I supported: In the committee amendment on page 69, in lines 12 and 13, we find the following:

Railroad safety, \$37,725.
Locomotive inspection, \$28,240.

If those two lines are stricken, will not the amendment just agreed to become effective?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, technically speaking, I am not certain of that. But I am of the opinion that what has been stated on the floor, together with the vote which has just been taken on the Senator's two amendments and his proposal to strike the two lines on page 69 would make very clear the intent of the Senate and any technical detail could be worked out in conference. I understood that the 5-percent cut originally contemplated in the committee would remain in effect because it would remain in the figure the Senator has stated in connection with this item.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am satisfied that would be accomplished.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct, and I point out that line 11 should also be included.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. I was about to point that out. It is the title of these items.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then, Mr. President, I move that in the committee amendment on page 69, lines 11, 12, and 13 be stricken out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 69, it is proposed to strike out lines 11, 12, and 13, reading as follows:

Interstate Commerce Commission:
Railroad safety, \$37,725.
Locomotive inspection, \$28,240.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert certain statements in the RECORD, in connection with the amendment dealing with locomotive inspection and railroad safety. I also want to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, the very able Senator from South Carolina (Mr. MAYBANK), for his generous attitude with respect to the appropriations requested by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

My reason for wanting these statements made a part of the record is so that they may be available to the conference committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the statements will be printed in the RECORD.

The statements are as follows:

STATEMENT COVERING APPROPRIATIONS, INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, BUREAUS OF MOTOR CARRIERS, TRANSPORT ECONOMICS, AND STATISTICS AND VALUATION

BUREAU OF MOTOR CARRIERS

The appropriation as proposed will make it necessary to substantially curtail enforcement of the law and regulations affecting motor carriers. It will result in complete discontinuance of highway safety work. These activities are already greatly undermanned; if discontinued or substantially curtailed, disorder in highway transportation and increased accidents may be expected. This might be disastrous in view of the greatly increased movement of explosives by highway at this time.

The reduction in the funds available for holding hearings and preparing decisions will further delay the determination of application and rate cases involving motor carriers. There is presently a backlog of 2,500 such cases, and more than 300 new cases are added each month. The proposed reduction will cause this backlog to increase. The present delays already cause justifiable complaint.

The proposed reduction will cause a reduction of 35 percent in the field staff, which is the source of information on which the Commission grants temporary authority to furnish emergency service. Handicapping the Commission in authorizing temporary service and causing delay in determining formal proceedings will prevent proper provision for necessary transportation, at a time when the need is greatest.

Field service

The field services of the Interstate Commerce Commission are the field services of the Defense Transport Administration. To eliminate any substantial number of field services of the Interstate Commerce Commission would eliminate correspondingly the field services of the Defense Transport Administration. To offset such reduction, the Defense Transport Administration would immediately have to supply itself with additional field services, which would in all probability cost the United States more money than the entire proposed cut to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The House appropriations would cut from the Interstate Commerce Commission's personnel, 232 employees.

BUREAU OF TRANSPORT ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS

The Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics studies, compiles, and publishes statistics concerning railroads, motor carriers, water carriers, pipelines, freight forwarders, private car lines, express and sleeping-car companies. These statistics which cover financial, traffic, and other vital data are in universal use in the transportation world. They are essential to the Commission in its regulatory duties and responsibilities; its financial investigations and findings; are a part of the record in all the major rate and revenue cases; are of inestimable value to the carriers, shippers, and other Government agencies, and are used by committees of Congress. The work of this Bureau is of necessity never quite current. Its serious impairment, as indicated by the present status of the appropriations, would be a tremendous blow to the regulation of transportation and most difficult and expensive to bring back in its present relationships.

BUREAU OF VALUATION

The Bureau of Valuation of the Commission must keep reasonably current the inventories and costs of properties of railroads and pipelines subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. This is essential to the Commission in prescribing just and reasonable rates, determining the divisions of joint rates and fares, prescribing switching charges, setting up depreciation reserves, determining costs of services, and in passing on financial reorganizations, mergers, and consolidations. This information, vital to the Commission, is also most useful to other governmental agencies and regulatory bodies and to Members of Congress.

Recently under mandate from the Congress, work in bringing pipeline valuation up to date was resumed in the face of a decrease in the appropriation. Progress has been made at the expense of other functions. The present status of appropriations in Congress would stop the pipeline valuation and so cripple and hinder the other operations vital to the Commission that valuation would become so far in arrears that at some future time it would be most difficult and most expensive to bring it reasonably current.

The work of the Commission would be seriously hampered if the work of the Bureau of Valuation were to become any further in arrears than at present.

BUREAU OF MOTOR CARRIERS

The allocation of the 1951 appropriation to the Bureau of Motor Carriers was \$3,742,149. The allocation of the 1952 appropriation as it passed the House of Representatives is \$2,799,060, a reduction of \$943,089. The reduction applies almost entirely to the work of hearings, and to highway safety and enforcement work.

The reduction in the amount available for holding hearings and preparing reports is \$84,897. The Commission has pending on its dockets 3,800 motor carriers proceedings, many of them several years old. Because of an increase in the staff authorized 2 years ago, the backlog was being reduced. If the present appropriation is continued, it is estimated that this work can become current within 2 years. The present delay in reaching decisions is frequently so long that the Commission has been subjected to criticism. As the law requires that no person may begin to furnish interstate service as a motor carrier without obtaining approval of the Commission and also provides that the Commission can determine whether rates filed by such carriers are reasonable and may be collected, any delay in reaching a determination on such matters in effect denies justice to the public. Unless the present appro-

riation for this work is continued, there will be a constant increase in the backlog and of the time required to reach decisions.

The reduction in the work of highway safety and enforcement and the field staff, which work is intermingled, is \$867,365, from \$2,075,554 at present to a proposed \$1,208,189. The reduction was made for the purpose of eliminating the highway safety work of the Commission. This would have serious consequences to every person using the highways, and, in view of the great increase in transportation of explosives and inflammables during the present emergency, the increased danger will affect also those persons residing near highways. The Interstate Commerce Commission is the only agency having jurisdiction in respect of safety of operation of interstate motor vehicles and hours of service of their drivers, and its jurisdiction covers every bus and truck operating in interstate or foreign commerce.

This work consists of preparation of safety regulations and of safety programs for motor carriers, inspection of the records and practices of carriers, analysis of accident reports and suggestions to eliminate unsafe practices and conditions, obtaining evidence of violations of the law or regulations, to presentation of evidence of violations in Commission proceedings and in prosecutions in the Federal courts. It has been demonstrated that this work, to the extent that it can be performed with the staff available, can reduce the danger and deaths by 50 percent.

It has been suggested that the safety work of the Commission is a duplication of work performed by the States. That is not correct. The kind of work performed is entirely different, and applies to different vehicles. As long as the Federal Government has assumed jurisdiction over safety practices of interstate operations, State regulation cannot be effective as to such operations. No State can effectively regulate hours of service of drivers of vehicles crossing the State, nor the operating practice. Patrolling the highways alone will not provide proper protection. Control of the carrier, and holding it responsible for the operation of its vehicles in all States in which it operates has been shown to be the best way to reduce accidents by motor carriers. This can be done only by a Federal agency, and the cost is minute in comparison with the saving in lives and property.

The desirability of reducing nondefense spending at this time is recognized, but transportation is not a nondefense industry. Highway accidents involving motor carriers involve loss of essential transportation equipment, loss of essential manpower, and loss or delay in delivering materials essential to the defense effort. There is no question that the Armed Forces are justified in spending money to assure safe delivery of material shipped on army trucks. It is equally important that the much greater quantity of defense freight moved on civilian trucks, as well as the freight essential to the civilian economy, be transported safely. It would be false economy to destroy the effectiveness of the one Federal agency which is working to reduce this loss at this time merely because it is one of our regular agencies and not one set up temporarily for defense purposes.

Field service

The field services of the Interstate Commerce Commission are the field services of the Defense Transport Administration. To eliminate any substantial number of field services of the Interstate Commerce Commission would eliminate correspondingly the field services of the Defense Transport Administration. To offset such reduction the defense Transport Administration would immediately have to supply itself with additional field services, which would in all

probability cost the United States more money than the entire proposed cut to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The House appropriations would cut from the Interstate Commerce Commission's personnel 232 employees.

BUREAU OF TRANSPORT ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS

The statistical and analytical work of the Commission's Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics will be seriously crippled during the fiscal year 1951-52 if the funds for its maintenance are reduced by about one-third, as indicated by the action of the House of Representatives. In the Commission's 1950 annual report to the Congress attention was called to the importance of the examination and tabulation of the returns contained in the monthly, quarterly, and annual reports filed by the various agencies of transport subject to the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. From these data the Bureau prepares a series of periodic publications all of which are necessary tools in connection with the Commission's regulatory duties. It would be impossible properly to administer many of the important provisions of the act if the Commission is not kept currently informed as to the trend in the railroad and operating statistics of the railroads, motor carries, carriers by pipeline, freight forwarders, private-car lines, and express- and sleeping-car companies. In all of the recent major rate and revenue cases a large number of the Bureau's periodic publications, including its waybill studies and the basic reports of the carriers from which the data are compiled, were made a continuing part of the record. These data are also of fundamental importance to the carriers, shippers, Government agencies, State commissions, practitioners, and others in preparing exhibits and evidence in Commission proceedings.

Because of the enlargement of the Commission's jurisdiction by various legislative enactments, the workload of the Bureau has increased greatly in recent years (about 60 percent since 1940). In presenting the budget for the fiscal year 1952, the Commission recommended that the Bureau's force be increased from 151 to 228 employees to cope with the situation. Subsequently the Bureau of the Budget, in its recommendations, allowed only eight additional positions.

If the House cut in the appropriation is allowed, the number of employees of the Bureau will be reduced from 153 at present to about 100. This will, of course, result in the dismissal of a large number of competent employees who are thoroughly trained in the various phases of the Bureau's work. Such a severe cut in personnel will immediately result in the curtailment of some of the Bureau's important functions. The examination and compilation of the various periodic returns filed by the carriers under orders of the Commission will be greatly delayed. This will, of course, delay and no doubt prevent the issuance of important publications, many of which are being currently used as a continuing part of the record in major cases pending before the Commission.

The Bureau's trained staff of economists, statisticians, and accountants, which is engaged in the analysis of transportation problems and in assisting the Commission in connection with rate, financial, and other proceedings, will also have to be drastically reduced. The loss of men trained in the highly technical field of transportation research will be a severe blow to the Commission.

BUREAU OF VALUATION

The cut in the budget estimate for 1952 proposed for the Bureau of Valuation by the House is based on the understanding that the amount for the fiscal year 1952 will be one-third less than that available for the

fiscal year 1951. This will mean a reduction of \$155,566 from a total of \$480,905, leaving \$325,339 available for 1952, reducing the Bureau's present staff from 89 to about 59, and separating 30 experienced employees with an average service of 25 years in a highly technical field.

Without any lessening in duties and responsibilities, the appropriation for this Bureau has been steadily reduced over the last 13 fiscal years from \$640,000 in 1939 to \$504,398 in 1950 and to \$480,905 in 1951, with the resulting decreases in employment from 187 in 1939 to 89 in 1950 and to 86 in 1951. Notwithstanding a 25-percent reduction in the appropriation for the fiscal year 1950, additional pipeline work was resumed in late 1949 by direction of Congress. The basic pipeline program will not, however, be completed during the fiscal year 1951, and with the reduction proposed in the House bill completion will be difficult, if not impossible. Further, after completion of the basic pipeline program there will remain the responsibility of keeping inventories and cost records current.

The continual reduction in personnel, especially that from 122 in 1949 to 89 in 1950, has placed the Bureau in a position of inability to keep up with its current program, and backlogs are accumulating rapidly. If the cut presently proposed is put into effect the Bureau will no longer be able to develop to any degree of currency the information required by the statutes and needed by the Commission in the performance of its regulatory functions.

In connection with keeping inventories and cost records, certain field checking is absolutely essential to assure dependability of results. With the 1951 funds only 19 field men are on the rolls, as compared with a requirement of at least 34. Under the proposed cut the field force would be completely eliminated.

Presently, the Bureau is engaged in furnishing certain important information to various defense agencies. This has been possible because its files contain data peculiarly fitted to develop such material.

With the appropriation recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, an increase in force of seven employees was provided for which would have enabled the Bureau of Valuation to recruit some new blood and to lower the average age of the technical employees which is now about 59 years.

In summation, if the Bureau of Valuation is cut to the extent now proposed, the result of long years of work and large expenditures of money devoted to the accumulation of the only over-all record in existence of physical consist and costs of carrier property will necessarily become of little current value. If this work is allowed to lapse it will be extremely difficult and costly to resume it at some later date. Such resumption is inevitable.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], I offer the amendment identified as "6-18-51-Q."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 70, between lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 604. No money appropriated by this act to any corporation or agency shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing information functions or related supporting functions, if the amount expended by such corporation or agency during the

fiscal year 1952 to pay such compensation is in excess of 75 percent of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by such corporation or agency during such fiscal year in the performance of information functions and related supporting functions. For the purposes of this section, the term "information functions" means functions usually performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title; and the term "related supporting functions" means functions performed by persons who assist persons performing information functions in the drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating of public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, and similar material.

On page 70, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "604" and in lieu thereof insert "605."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Virginia will yield, I merely desired to call attention to a typographical error I noted when the amendment was being read by the clerk. In line 5 the word "forming" should be corrected to "performing." I imagine the Senator from Virginia would desire that that correction be made. It was for that reason that I rose while the amendment was being read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia may make the modification.

Mr. BYRD. I ask that the amendment be modified, in section 604, line 5, by striking out "forming" and inserting "performing."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be modified accordingly.

PUBLICITY EXPERTS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to correct one of the greatest abuses in our governmental services. Since 1913, it has been illegal, by virtue of an act of Congress, for governmental agencies to employ any publicity experts unless appropriations are specifically made for that purpose. Notwithstanding that, Mr. President, every agency of the Government has publicity agents. It is true they are not called by that name, but they are scattered throughout the departments. I am presenting an amendment, which is the only way by which the question can be reached, which provides that for the purpose of information functions only 75 percent of the money recommended by the Bureau of the Budget shall be available for expenditure under this bill.

I call attention to a long fight which has been made for the purpose of trying to eliminate these publicity agents, whose employment, as I have said, has been illegal since 1913, when an act was placed on the statute books providing that no money appropriated by Congress should be used for the compensation of any publicity expert, unless specifically appropriated for that purpose.

EFFECT OF THE AMENDMENT

The effect of the amendment would be, as I said, to limit expenditure of funds appropriated in this act for personal service to 75 percent of the amount requested by the President in his budget estimates to pay employees whose functions are those of publicity experts and their assistants, and those engaged in related supporting activities, such as typing, mimeographing, mailing, and so forth.

Any reduction in personal service funds resulting from this amendment could, of course, be applied to the requirements of the Cordon and Ferguson amendments.

NEWSPAPERMEN—PUBLISHERS—VAST GOVERNMENT

Mr. President, I am a newspaperman and a publisher. I have great sympathy for the problems of both. Nothing I shall say is intended to reflect upon either; and I am certain that if this amendment is intelligently and efficiently administered it will result in more news and less "bull" from the Federal publicity mill.

I am aware that no newspaper, no press association, no radio chain, and no newsreel publisher could possibly finance enough of a staff adequately to cover the vast domain of the Federal Government without the assistance of legitimate press services to be maintained within the Federal Establishment. But the fact remains that this necessity for services to the public press which results from big government is subject to abuse in the form of propagandization, political figures, and political programs such as the Brannan plan.

PROBLEM

Individual glorification of bureaucrats and political propaganda constitute the press service problem which this amendment seeks to curtail. It has been a problem for a long time. Since 1913, as I said, there has been a statute on the books providing that no money appropriated by Congress shall be used for the compensation of any publicity expert unless specifically appropriated for that purpose.

I sum up the debate on the problem, which is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 50, part 11, pages 4805 and 4806, as follows:

No person should be employed as a press agent by a Government agency to extol his boss or to advertise the work of the department, but we ought to have men in the various departments to make available facts about the work of these departments to the public.

The amendment which is proposed by myself and the Senators associated with me, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], allows a sufficient appropriation to make facts available about the work of the departments, but it will, I think, compel the dismissal of all those who are being employed as publicity experts, of whom

there are many thousands of them, and who are acting as such.

In 1937 the Brookings Institution, in a report for the Senate Select Committee To Investigate Executive Agencies of the Government, said:

Notwithstanding the fact that the employment of publicity experts is forbidden by the act of October 22, 1913 (38 Stat. L. 208, 212), unless funds are specifically appropriated for that purpose, publicity agents are nevertheless appointed under other designations, and one of the results has been an increasing flood of press releases produced by the process method.

Later, in 1947, the House committee headed by Representative Harness said:

It is a duty of representative government to keep the people fully and accurately informed. Administrative officials at policy making levels are and should be entirely free to express their views and discuss policy on any issue. But beyond the regular news channels no agency properly may go. The information services of the administrative agencies may not lawfully use public funds to promote new projects, to influence legislation—

They are doing that now—

or to mold public opinion for or against any legislative proposal. * * * The sole legal function of Federal information service is to issue factual, objective, and studiously unbiased information.

The Harness report continued:

Unfortunately, the law is being violated repeatedly by numerous administrative agencies. In hundreds of ways, some devious, some blatant, Federal officials and employees are ignoring or flouting section 201 of title 18 of the Criminal Code, often for the deliberate purpose of fostering sentiment and support for administration policies and programs.

The issue is far broader than the merits of any particular piece of legislation. The record reveals clearly the manner in which Government lobbyists operate on the Federal payroll, how they are always at work to expand their fields of interest, to perpetuate themselves in office, and to impose their ideas and systems upon the American people by organized propaganda paid for entirely by the diversion of public funds from their true purposes to the secret purposes of top bureaucrats and planners.

Then came the Hoover Commission report. In its preparation, a task force on Government publicity and propaganda started out by saying:

Federal operations in publicity, public relations, and dissemination of Government intelligence cost the taxpayers approximately \$105,000,000 a year.

The Hoover Commission Task Force said further:

Every agency of the Government maintains its public relations staff. Every agency issues printed matter in great or small volume every year for public distribution. Printing costs on Government literature approach \$50,000,000 a year, and the mailing costs, computed at regular postage rates add \$40,000,000 a year.

Staff salaries in publicity functions were tabulated by the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal year 1948 at \$13,000,000, but this figure does not include—

I am quoting from the report of the Hoover Commission Task Force—

editorial and research expense in the preparation of Government intelligence. The Budget Bureau's itemization begins with

preparation of the press release, radio continuity or motion-picture scripts. The research and testing behind the press release are not charged to the publicity function, but rather to the routine administrative expenses of the department.

Then the Hoover Commission Task Force touched on that facet of the problem which makes it difficult to be reached by any sort of legislation. It said:

In many cases public-relations work is concealed entirely from routine accounting review, principally by the device of carrying publicity operatives on the roll as supervisors, administrative assistants, or technical experts.

They never call them "publicity experts"; they give them some other name.

For these reasons in the present state of the Federal budget and accounting procedures, a precise itemization of Government expenditures in this broad field is almost impossible.

For this reason the language of the pending amendment is directed to functions performed, no matter what the title may be, or at what station in Civil Service ranks and grades the employee may be.

In this bill, and in the Government, now it is still virtually impossible to determine how many people there are engaged in so-called information work in the Federal Government, but the Civil Service Commission admits to 4,199 who can be positively identified in these positions. A check of the appendix to the budget document reveals that of this number there are more than 100 such positions covered by the independent offices appropriation bill, and that the salaries run to nearly three-quarters of a million dollars. Undoubtedly there are others in high positions who cannot be identified in the detailed personnel tables, and still others engaged in clerical, mechanical, and transportation jobs connected with publicity which would more than double—probably treble—both the number of people involved and the personal-service costs.

But this is not all that is involved. We become involved also in the paper shortage, in the purchase of duplicating equipment, and especially in the cost of disseminating the material through the mail.

VOLUME AND MAIL COSTS

The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures on April 19 started a sampling of material printed and otherwise duplicated by Government agencies for public dissemination. In 2 months, exclusive of the material printed by the Government Printing Office, Government publications, mimeographed and otherwise processed, have been received at the rate of a file case full a week, exclusive of envelopes and wrappings. That means single statements and all publicity sent out. By actual count in the mails of Saturday and Monday morning 2,226 separate pieces were received. All of this, of course, was delivered under the free penalty mail privileges. On page 741 of the budget document, the Post Office Department reveals that in fiscal year 1952 it expects to handle 1,780,000,000 pieces of penalty mail from Gov-

ernment departments and agencies in the executive branch. That is approximately a letter a month from the executive branch departments and agencies to every man, woman, and child in the country. This volume of penalty mail represents an increase of nearly a hundred million a day over the volume handled last year, which totaled less than a billion and a half pieces.

Examples of some of the material which is going through the mails is a pamphlet called *Filipino Women—Their Role in the Progress of Their Nation*, published by the Labor Department; *Raccoons of North and Middle America: North American Fauna No. 60*, published by the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; and then there is the gem by the ECA entitled "ECA's Dilemma—Can Elephants and Water Buffalos Outwork Machinery?" This is a little article about 5-day weeks for elephants working in Burma. The ECA found that elephants do not like to work in the hot sun.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Executive Office issued any publication concerning the Byrds of Virginia?

Mr. BYRD. There has been some comment about that, I believe.

The ECA has found that elephants do not like to work in the hot sun, and that in March and April they should be sent to a rest camp, and also that they should be given about 2 weeks vacation again in October.

Mr. President, that is where some of our money is going.

It is no wonder that I and other Senators are receiving numerous complaints about the stuff which is being received by citizens all over the country, about the uselessness of the material which they are receiving through the mails, in the nature of Government publications from the executive departments of the Government.

I receive letters, and I assume other Senators receive similar letters, saying "For God's sake stop sending all this mail." It is thrown away because the recipients have no use for it; yet the mails are filled up with it.

A typical paragraph is quoted from a letter from Mr. H. W. Osgood of the Youngstown, Ohio, Modern Furniture Store. Mr. Osgood writes:

I enclose a copy of a publication, *The Agricultural Situation*, April 1951, which we received in the mail today. This publication has no value to us (in the furniture business).

Mr. Osgood further suggested that instead of unnecessarily oversized heavy envelopes the Government might use cheaper self-mailers. The Government gets the most expensive paper and envelopes it can obtain.

As I have said, this material which is now coming into our office does not include any publications disseminated by the Government Printing Office. In addition, publications disseminated by the Government Printing Office, printed in fine type, cover 78 pages of an attractive green-bound monthly catalog, and exclusive of the Military Establishment,

the appendix to the budget reveals that the Government's printing bill for fiscal year 1952 is estimated at \$41 million, and the Military Establishment will more than double this figure when the estimates are counted.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I correct in my interpretation of what the Senator has said, that the Senate having approved an amendment which inspired department heads to drive their own cars, the Senator from Virginia now proposes another amendment which will require Senators to write their own speeches?

Mr. BYRD. I hope that will be the effect of it. I do not know whether it would improve the quality of the speeches.

All my amendment would do, as I have said, is to limit expenditures for the purposes enumerated to 75 percent of the figure recommended by the Budget.

Actually, this amendment simply points up a field of Federal personnel costs where the requirements of the Cordon and Ferguson amendments may be absorbed in nonessential activities.

I have no fear about serious impairment of essential Federal functions resulting from this amendment in any agency headed by an efficient administrator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we cut down personnel 10 percent, what the Senator's amendment would do, in substance, would be to cut the personnel used for this informative service by another 15 percent, would it not?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct. Much discretion is given to the bureaus of the Government. If the Ferguson amendment applies to them, the cut would be 25 percent. The total would not be in excess of 25 percent.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I take it that the Senator's amendment would not apply to legitimate informational work, such as that done by the Bureau of the Census, would it?

Mr. BYRD. No; it is not intended to do that. The publicity experts are not set forth separately in the budget. I feel that 75 percent will be entirely adequate for handling reports and other things which are important to the people.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has one more minute.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have been working on this subject for a number of years. I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a table headed "Estimated expenditures for educational, informational, promotional, and publicity activities, executive branch of the Federal Government, fiscal year 1946, by departments and agencies." The total sum to be spent in 1946 for those purposes was \$74,829,467. This table is 6 years

old but I think it may be the latest and most complete indicator of the functions we are talking about. I had it in my files as a survey that I had once requested the Bureau of the Budget to make for me.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated expenditures for educational, informational, promotional, and publicity activities, executive branch of the Federal Government, fiscal year 1946, by departments and agencies

	Total expenditures
Total, executive branch-----	\$74,829,467
Executive Office of the President-----	8,154,021
White House-----	6,103
Bureau of the Budget-----	165,700
Office for Emergency Management:	
Civilian Production Administration-----	172,000
Committee on Fair Employment Practice-----	3,370
Foreign Economic Administration ¹ -----	15,175
Alien Property Custodian-----	121,000
Office of Defense Transportation-----	207,000
Office of Inter-American Affairs ² -----	886,178
Office of Scientific Research and Development-----	6,800
Office of War Information ¹ -----	3,772,095
War Shipping Administration-----	157,000
Office of Price Administration-----	2,572,000
Petroleum Administration for War-----	69,600
Independent establishments-----	2,627,808
American Battle Monuments Commission-----	0
Civil Service Commission-----	204,000
Employees' Compensation Commission-----	9,000
Export-Import Bank of Washington-----	6,700
Federal Communications Commission-----	24,363
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation-----	4,650
Federal Power Commission-----	75,266
Federal Trade Commission-----	27,417
Interstate Commerce Commission-----	43,000
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics-----	171,000
National Archives-----	19,400
National Capital Housing Authority-----	500
National Capital Park and Planning Commission-----	0
National Labor Relations Board-----	21,400
National Mediation Board-----	3,063
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion-----	292,000
Office of the Director-----	180,000
Office of Contract Settlement-----	22,000
Surplus Property Administration-----	90,000

¹ To date of liquidation.

² Liquidated in part during 1946 fiscal year.

Estimated expenditures for educational, informational, etc.—Continued

Independent establishments—Continued	Total expenditures
Railroad Retirement Board	\$17,300
Securities and Exchange Commission	91,000
Selective Service System	19,500
Smaller War Plants Corporation	279,100
Smithsonian Institution	134,000
National Gallery of Art	24,850
Tariff Commission	25,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	245,000
The Tax Court of the United States	30,728
United States Maritime Commission	199,000
Veterans' Administration	660,571
Federal Loan Agency	331,167
Federal Security Agency	2,043,988
Federal Works Agency	89,295
National Housing Agency	343,616
Department of Agriculture	9,295,700
Department of Commerce	2,003,212
Department of Interior	387,569
Department of Justice	199,000
Department of Labor	1,440,641
Navy Department	704,000
Post Office Department	11,960
Department of State	30,377,000
Treasury Department	11,104,800
War Department ²	5,715,690

² Exclusive of pay and allowances of military personnel.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have another table printed in the RECORD, another table I have had in my files, showing the number of personnel engaged in public relations and publicity activities in the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1949, totaling approximately \$8,162,505.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Personnel engaged in public relations and publicity activities, Department of Defense, fiscal year 1949

Department	Military	Civilian	Total personnel	Total compensation
Departmental	273	255	528	\$1,806,584
OSD	0	10	10	46,517
Army	75	141	216	745,123
Navy	155	47	202	542,555
Air Force	43	57	100	472,389
Field	1,585	593	2,178	6,355,921
OSD	0	0	0	0
Army	566	344	910	2,259,838
Navy	315	43	358	1,556,083
Air Force	704	206	910	2,540,000
Total	1,858	848	2,706	8,162,505
OSD	0	10	10	46,517
Army	641	485	1,126	3,004,961
Navy	470	90	560	2,068,638
Air Force	747	263	1,010	3,012,389

NOTE: Compensation for Air Force enlisted personnel excludes subsistence and quarters allowances.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I may say that I agreed to give some time to the Senator from Michigan, and I ask unanimous consent that he be given 5 minutes additional time.

Mr. MAYBANK. I object.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. Some abuses may have been disclosed, but there may also be some value to the publications mentioned. Sometimes Government agencies are criticized for not giving out sufficient information.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may I be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAYBANK. I hope the Senator from Virginia will permit me to say a word.

Mr. BYRD. I wish to discuss the point of order.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that, but the reason why I objected was because the Senator from Michigan asked me one or two questions, and I said I would discuss the questions with him in the time I had remaining.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That does not affect the Senator's time on the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wanted to invite the attention of the Chair to the fact that section 603 deals with the same subject, and was passed by the House.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is my judgment that section 603 should have remained in the bill.

Mr. BYRD. I am speaking to the point of order. The amendment is a limitation on expenditures. I again invite attention to section 603 of the bill. There is no contingency whatever involved in the amendment which the Senator from Virginia has offered. It is a limitation on expenditures, along the same lines as was the Ferguson amendment, which was declared to be in order by the Presiding Officer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under rule XVI, no limitation on an appropriation bill is permissible which depends for its validity upon a future contingency. The amendment of the Senator from Virginia provides that not more than 75 percent of the amount is to be made available for the information services, and that the departments involved must look into the question and determine, as the year goes along, whether the 75 percent has been reached or has been exceeded. It also involves the definition of informational services. The Chair is of the opinion that there is a contingency involved, and also a definition, and that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I respectfully invite the attention of the Chair to the fact that there is no contingency, and that the amendment is exactly along the same line as the Ferguson amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Ferguson amendment was a straight-out reduction.

Mr. BYRD. It was based upon budget estimates, just as is my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct, but it does not contain the terms which are contained in the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, may I be heard prior to the final decision of the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The bill contains legislation on the same point in section 603—

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not want to be misunderstood in this situation, because we went over it very thoroughly in the committee. The reason for section 603 being stricken out was that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and another Senator thought it might apply to farmers' bulletins which farmers requested. I am relying on my memory. However, I may be wrong.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, when the bill came from the House it contained this language:

No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

At the present time there is a statute on the books, section 54 of title V, United States Code, which provides as follows:

No money appropriated by any act shall be used for the compensation of any publicity expert unless specifically appropriated for that purpose.

That law was passed on October 22, 1913. It is chapter 32, paragraph 1, Thirty-eighth Statutes, page 212.

The Byrd amendment is merely a limitation on the amount of the budget estimate, so the specific 75 percent is already determined. No determination is necessary to be made in the carrying out of the provisions of the amendment. I hope the ruling of the Chair will be that this is not legislation, because it could be part and parcel of section 603, which provides the same kind of a limitation. Therefore I hope the point of order will not be upheld.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask the Chair a question, in the nature of a parliamentary inquiry? Would it not be possible for the Senator from Virginia to move to reconsider the committee amendment striking out section 603? If the committee amendment were rejected, and the House provision were restored, would not an amendment to the House language then be in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Section 603 is the language that came from the House. The Senate committee struck out that language, and the Senate committee amendment has been agreed to. The only way to proceed in that connection is to reconsider the vote by which the Senate committee amendment was adopted.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate committee amendment was adopted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understood that all committee amendments which were adopted were adopted with the understanding that Senators would have the privilege of reopening them without moving to reconsider the vote by which the amendments were adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct, but action would have to be taken by the Senate in order to do what the Senator suggests be done.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was my understanding that it was specifically agreed that no reconsideration of the votes by which amendments were agreed would be necessary in order to take action on the amendments. While all the committee amendments were agreed to en bloc, they were agreed to with the understanding that they could be reopened or reconsidered merely by the action of Senators in offering amendments to the committee amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ordinarily the procedure is to move to reconsider the vote by which a committee amendment was adopted. However, under the unanimous-consent agreement with respect to committee amendments to the bill, it was agreed that if any Senator wished to offer an amendment to a committee amendment, which would ordinarily make it necessary to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to, all he would have to do would be to offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not think it requires any motion, in view of the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into. A point of order is pending as to the language of the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have been requested to withdraw the point of order. I will say, however, that I am sincere in my belief that if the amendment of the Senator from Virginia should be adopted the result would be to cut out publicity which should be given. The Senator from Virginia thinks that certain things are being done which should not be done. On the other hand, others are criticizing the administration for not doing certain things. I do not think reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment striking out section 603 was agreed to will make any difference. There still will remain the question of a point of order. I feel that the questions involved should be considered by a legislative committee, which could give the time carefully to consider the effects of the various proposals. I am not opposing the principle the Senator from Virginia is trying to maintain, but I think the subject is one which should be brought before

the proper committee. If the Senator should introduce a bill dealing with the subject, I am sure it would receive careful consideration. I do not think this is the time to consider the question. The Senate has adopted certain rules, and we should live up to them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I respectfully say that I believe the Senator from South Carolina will agree with me that the subcommittee cut out section 603 not so much because it opposed it, but because it did not think it was framed in proper language and form, and that we felt that the section should be stricken so that it might be further considered and rewritten in proper form.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. It is my recollection that fear was expressed by some members of the subcommittee that the action would seriously impair the publication and distribution of the Farmers' Bulletin. So the committee struck out section 603, with the idea that it would be taken to conference. Is that not the recollection of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HILL. That is my recollection, Mr. President. It was feared that there might be interference with the publication and the distribution of the Farmers' Bulletin to the farmers of the country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must pass on the point of order, and not on the merits. The Chair would say that he is not certain that if section 603 as adopted by the House, were restored, the amendment of the Senator from Virginia still would not be subject to the point of order that it is limitation based on a contingency, and also that it contains legislation in the form of definition of terms which are not now in the law and which would constitute legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Massachusetts will say very frankly that perhaps it is not a parliamentary inquiry. However, I should like to put the question: Cannot Section 603 as adopted by the House be restored by simply reconsidering the action by which the Senate committee amendment was agreed to? Or if the Senate feels that the House language is not in proper form, then it certainly can amend that language, can it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. By any germane amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So if the amendment of the Senator from Virginia is germane it would be proper to attach it as an amendment to section 603. I ask that as a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question of germaneness is not one of which the Chair, in connection with an appropriation bill, can pass, because the rule provides that that question should be submitted to the Senate. If the language of the House bill in section 603 should be restored, undoubtedly any

germane amendment to that section would then be in order. If the question were raised as to its germaneness it would have to be submitted to the Senate as a parliamentary question, on which the Senate would pass and not the Chair. But any germane amendment to the House language would be in order, although the Chair would not wish to say in advance than an amendment which constituted legislation or put a limitation on an appropriation contingent on some future event would be in order. The Chair is not passing on that now.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement. If the amendment of the Senator from Virginia should be ruled out on a point of order it seems to me that the whole purpose of the Senate committee in striking out section 603 in the hope of obtaining better language to cover the purposes of the section, would be destroyed, and the whole theory on which the committee acted would be frustrated.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests to Senators that if section 603, which has been stricken out by action of the Senate, remains in that status, it will be before the conferees, and they will have the right to modify it in any way which is not beyond their power, as between the language of both Houses. If section 603 is restored and there is no amendment to it in the Senate, it will not be in conference. It will go into the bill as the House has written it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is not the question now before the Senate the restoration of section 603?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. The Chair thinks that the point of order is the question which is pending.

Mr. FERGUSON. May the Senator from Virginia withdraw his amendment and ask for the restoration of section 603, and then offer his amendment to that section, and have the Senate pass upon the question of germaneness?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia may withdraw his amendment by unanimous consent, and then proceed to some other amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may I speak to the point of order?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator withdrawing the amendment? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask reconsideration of the action taken by the Senate with respect to section 603, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement; and I ask that it be restored to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia asks that the vote by which the amendment striking out section 603 was adopted, be reconsidered, and that that language be restored for the further consideration of the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, we had a unanimous-consent agreement that any of the committee amendments which were agreed to en bloc could be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into at the time the bill was taken up, any Senator has the right to ask that a committee amendment be reconsidered.

Mr. BYRD. There was an agreement that there would be no objection to the reconsideration of any of the committee amendments.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely reserved the right to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not think that under the agreement an objection would avail anything. The Senator may reserve the right to object.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is all I ask. There is no need for the Senator from Virginia to be disturbed about what I have to say.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator said he objected.

Mr. MAYBANK. I said I reserved the right to object.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator going to object, or not?

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to make it perfectly clear that I believe that before we consider this question there should be a quorum call, so that Senators who objected in the subcommittee to section 603 being in the bill may have an opportunity to be present. I do not want to have the question considered in their absence.

Mr. BYRD. Every other Senator has had the privilege of having the action of the Senate with respect to committee amendments reconsidered. I do not take it with any special appreciation that the Senator from South Carolina is objecting to my request.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have not objected. Mr. BYRD. Such requests have been acceded to in every other instance, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have not objected. I merely reserved the right to object. I have stated that before the action suggested is taken—and as chairman of the subcommittee, I feel that the Senator from Virginia should agree with me—the other members of the subcommittee should know what we intend to do with respect to section 603. I did not move to strike it out. As I stated, I had hoped that it would remain in the bill. But some Senator moved to strike it out. Frankly, I will say to the Senator from Virginia that I do not remember which Senator moved to strike it out; but I believe that members of the subcommittee should be present before action is taken.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I renew my request that the action whereby section 603 was stricken from the bill by the committee amendment be reconsidered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I hope the Senator will not insist upon a quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is not subject to an objection.

Mr. McFARLAND. May I complete my statement, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. McFARLAND. It was understood that we might take this action. I merely wish to say that I do not believe, when we take out section 603, that any department should have the right to use publicity or propaganda to defeat or support legislation. However, that is not the point of order which I was making. I believe that the amendment of the Senator from Virginia is definitely new legislation, other than that contained in the House provision in section 603, and I shall make the point of order against the amendment just the same.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to section 603 being put back in the bill. I reserve the right to object until I can find out who made the motion to strike it out. I think I am entitled to that opportunity.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I renew my request.

Mr. MAYBANK. That question has nothing to do with the point of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? The Senate committee reduced the appropriation for personnel 10 percent, as shown by the new section 603 on page 69. If that section is stricken out that reduction will be stricken out.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I may say to the chairman of the full committee that there is no difference of opinion between the Senator from Virginia and myself about the section 603 which has been stricken out. However, I wish to show the proper courtesy to members of the subcommittee who objected to the section at the time. I suggest that they be present. That is all I have asked. I am certain that the Senator from Virginia would extend the same courtesy to a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks he can clear up this situation.

Under the rules, when an amendment is offered and a point of order is made with respect to it, during the discussion of the point of order the sponsor of the amendment may withdraw the amendment without having unanimous consent. If the Chair had actually ruled on the point of order, the amendment could not be withdrawn. While the Chair has indicated how he might rule, he has not actually ruled on the point of order, and therefore the Senator from Virginia may withdraw the amendment if he wishes, without asking unanimous consent. Does the Senator from Virginia wish to do that?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment which I have offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia withdraws his amendment, and he moves that the Senate disagree to the amendment striking out section 603. That question is now before the Senate. [Putting the question.]

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I trust that we shall wait until members

of the subcommittee can return to the Chamber.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is the unanimous-consent agreement, as stated by the Presiding Officer on page 6817:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An agreement was entered into Friday that the amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations should be considered as agreed to en bloc, with the privilege reserved to any Senator to offer an amendment in the second degree without reconsideration.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I do not know what the Senator wants to do. Does he want to have a quorum call, or shall we stand here indefinitely until some Senator comes into the Chamber?

Mr. MAYBANK. No.

Mr. BYRD. I am not going to withdraw my request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia has made a motion, on which he has 15 minutes. The Senator from South Carolina may have 15 minutes in opposition to the motion. Does the Senator from Virginia wish to take time on his motion?

Mr. BYRD. I have no desire to take time on the motion now.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have no desire to take time on the motion, because I have been advised that the Senators who were interested at the time are not now interested. That is all I wanted to find out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Virginia that the Senate disagree to the amendment striking out section 603.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Therefore the original language of the House in section 603 is restored.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment which I have previously offered, as an amendment to section 603, beginning in line 17, after the word "Congress."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment has already been read, and therefore it will not be necessary to read it again.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia is new legislation, offered on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will hear the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I believe that the Chair has well stated the contingency which is involved. The Department must determine when 75 percent has been used, and there must be a definition as to what is propaganda, and so forth.

I think it is a dangerous field that we are getting into, when we try to insert in appropriation bills on the floor of the Senate definitions which change legislation. I do not care to argue the question at length. I think the Chair has better stated the rule than I could state it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will ask the Senator from Arizona to read section 603 so that we may have clearly in mind what it says.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Chair ask me to read it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Section 603. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It seems to me that we are now getting ourselves into the position which the committee did not want us to get into. We have adopted the House language. Unless we accept an amendment like the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia or a similar amendment, the section will not be open to conference and to a change in language. In that case we would have language in the bill which we thought was not good language.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is the reason I reserved the right to object, because it was the desire of the subcommittee that the original language should not stay in the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. We have not adopted the amendment. All that we have done was to repeal the action adopting the amendment. It is now before the Senate. The Senator from Virginia offers an amendment to the amendment of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is mistaken. The Senator from Virginia moved that the committee amendment be disagreed to. The Senator's motion was agreed to. That action restored the language of the House bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. I consider the amendment of the Senator from Virginia to be far more dangerous than the original language. All of us agree on the principle involved. However, when it comes to the question of publicity to be used by departments, I do not know what might be involved. If we were considering a health bill, we would know what was involved.

We should not legislate on an appropriation bill. We should have the amendment go first to a committee and have the committee give careful consideration to it. We have committees established for that purpose. Let us use the committees.

Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. BYRD, Mr. THYE, and Mr. MOODY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to offer a suggestion. The Chair is confronted with an important point of order, which he does not wish to rule on without having sufficient advice on it. Inasmuch as other amendments are to be offered, and it does not appear as though we shall finish consideration of the pending bill today, the Chair would inquire if it would be agreeable to let the amendment go over temporarily until tomorrow so that the

Chair may look further into the question involved.

Mr. McFARLAND. It would be agreeable to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. BYRD. It would be agreeable to the Senator from Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If it is agreeable, the Chair will look into the question before the Senate convenes tomorrow.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am certain that the Senator from Virginia was confining his motion to the reconsideration of the original section 603.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. His motion had no reference to the new section 603, which was written in following the recommittal of the bill to the Committee on Appropriations; is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. I said page 67.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I ask the Senator from Virginia to state definitely that he does not refer to the new section, having to do with the reduction of appropriations for personnel?

Mr. BYRD. I think the RECORD is clear. I have already stated that I refer to section 603 on page 67. What I have said applies to the old section 603, not to the new section.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment temporarily goes over. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I raise a point of order with respect to the language in the bill at page 63, lines 6 to 13, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is a committee amendment which has been agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator have reference to the Inland Waterways Corporation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. We heard the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce on that point. As he is chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Senator from Colorado understands my position. I am glad he brought up the point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had a proposal before it authorizing \$18,000,000 for the purpose of purchasing barges. The bill was before the committee a long time. We gave it a great deal of consideration. It was not enacted by Congress. Now the bill contains an amendment which reads:

Provided further, That the Corporation may use its funds to purchase equipment on credit or otherwise, and in so doing may mortgage or pledge equipment as security for the payment of any obligations representing the balance of the purchase price, and for this purpose may enter into purchase money mortgages, conditional sales contracts, equipment trusts, or other similar methods of financing.

The proviso makes it possible for the operators of the Government Barge Line to pledge for loans, property of the United States. I believe it is a very improper proviso. However, my point of

order is based on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan agrees that it is general language and therefore it is legislation in an appropriation bill. Does it not attempt to do indirectly what the committee had before it? It would permit the Corporation to use Government money for the purchase of additional barges. It would allow them to mortgage Government property, which at the present time is owned by the Corporation, and use the money for the purchase of additional barges, or as they may see fit to use the money.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The barges which the corporation owns belong to the United States of America.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. Therefore, they are trying to do indirectly what they have not been permitted to do directly by the committee.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. LONG. I should like to point out for the benefit of the Senator that it is my understanding that the attorneys who have examined the question have arrived at the opinion that the Federal Barge Line does have the right to borrow such money as may be necessary to make purchases of equipment out of funds it may have on hand from the mortgaging of equipment. However, out of an abundance of caution, so that there would be no doubt so far as banks making such loans were concerned, it was thought wise to clear up any doubt that might exist.

I would say to the Senator from Colorado that actually the purpose of the amendment is to make it possible to replace some worn-out equipment with a smaller amount of better equipment, which would reduce the loss of the barge line and probably would put the barge line into the black, instead of having it continue to operate in the red. It would involve only a small amount of funds. I believe I can give the Senator some figures I have available.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In either case it is legislation and should come before our committee in the regular way.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator will find that actual legislation is not necessary, and for the most part the attorneys have advised me that it is not necessary. However, there is some doubt in this situation. Therefore, it probably would be wise to have the doubt cleared up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If there is any doubt, it should be removed by means of legislation handled in the regular way by the committees which are authorized to handle legislation on this subject.

I repeat that at one time there was before the committee a bill calling for an authorization of an appropriation of \$18,000,000 for this purpose, but Congress did not pass the bill. The committee did not report the bill favorably, and Congress has never passed such a measure.

So I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to determine whether he has a proper understanding of the unusual unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into, by means of which all the committee amendments were adopted en bloc, with the reservation of the right for any Senator to offer an amendment to any committee amendment which thus was agreed to.

By analogy, but not by the specific terms of the agreement, the Chair would assume that if a Senator has a right, after a committee amendment is agreed to, to offer an amendment to it, he would have a right to make a point of order against it. Only on that basis could the Chair entertain the point of order at this time.

The Parliamentarian indicates that the Chair's opinion on that subject is what the Senate had in mind at the time when the agreement was entered into.

Therefore, the Chair can entertain the point of order against the amendment, although it has been agreed to.

The Chair would like to have the language of the bill to which the amendment is offered read.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, let me submit that in this section of the bill as it was passed by the House there is already general language dealing with this matter, namely, the Inland Waterways Corporation, and dealing with other matters. In view of the language included in that section by the House, which also is general legislation, I believe that an amendment such as that reported by the Senate committee is in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to have the language of this portion of the bill, as passed by the House, read in connection with the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I rise to a point of information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What must I do in order to make my point of order in that case?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator does not have to do anything. The Chair is entertaining the point of order at this time, but the Chair would like to have the original language of the bill as passed by the House read, along with the amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to point out—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will suspend for a minute, please. The Chair, for his own information, would like to have the language of this section of the bill as passed by the House read. The clerk will please read it.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

Inland Waterways Corporation (administered under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Commerce): Not to exceed \$481,200 shall be available for administrative expenses, to be determined in the manner set forth until the title "General expenses"

in the Uniform System of Accounts for Carriers by Water of the Interstate Commerce Commission (effective January 1, 1947): *Provided*, That no funds shall be used to pay compensation of employees normally subject to the Classification Act of 1949 at rates in excess of rates fixed for similar services under the provisions of said act, nor to pay the compensation of vessel employees and such terminal and other employees as are not covered by said act, at rates in excess of rates prevailing in the river transportation industry in the area (including prevailing leave allowances for vessel employees, but the granting of such allowances shall not be construed as establishing a different leave system within the meaning of that term as used in section 3 of the Act of December 21, 1944 (5 U. S. C. 61d)):

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would now like to have the Senate committee amendment read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Provided further, That the Corporation may use its funds to purchase equipment on credit or otherwise, and in so doing may mortgage or pledge equipment as security for the payment of any obligations representing the balance of the purchase price, and for this purpose may enter into purchase money mortgages, conditional sales contracts, equipment trusts, or other similar methods of financing.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, let me point out that the language beginning on page 62, in line 25, dealing with the compensation of employees, including the words "and other employees as are not covered by said act," and I stress these words "at rates in excess of rates prevailing in the river transportation industry in the area" amounts to requiring the Corporation to determine what the rates are in private industry and to make the rates of the Corporation not in excess of the rates in private industry. Therefore that would be general legislation relating to the manner in which the Corporation could use its funds. The amendment proposed to that section of the bill is of the same type, namely, it relates to the manner in which the Corporation can use its funds.

Furthermore, the attorneys have advised the Corporation and have advised the committee that the Corporation already has a right to use its funds in that manner. This is merely a matter of clearing up any doubt as to the manner in which the funds may be used, although the Senate committee proposal is not so broad as the House proposal in regard to the way in which the use of the funds should be restricted.

Therefore, it seems to me that the Senate committee amendment is of the same nature as the language adopted by the House in this portion of the bill, both of them relating to the manner in which the funds may be used, and that therefore the committee amendment is in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to speak to the point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that in the hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill, the following appears on page 161, in connection with

the testimony of Secretary of Commerce Sawyer in regard to these funds:

I propose to use the funds available as a down payment upon a substantial quantity of new equipment, to be financed on a short-term basis through equipment trusts or some similar method, if such financing can be arranged.

This is the important point:

The Attorney General has advised me that I have authority to purchase new equipment on this basis. However, in attempting to make arrangements for such purchases, questions have been raised by prospective financiers of the new equipment as to my authority, as to the validity of the Attorney General's decision.

NEED FOR CLARIFICATION OF LANGUAGE OF LAW

I believe it would be appropriate for this committee to clarify my authority to use the Corporation's funds in this manner.

Then there was colloquy between the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the Secretary of Commerce, as follows:

Senator MAYBANK. You gentlemen know the question about legislation on appropriations during all of these Marshall-plan fights and the Chair's ruling. So if you could work up something that would be satisfactory, the committee would be glad to give consideration to it.

Secretary SAWYER. We will see that your committee gets that.

Senator MAYBANK. You can get it both ways and if we see a chance of doing it, we could do it.

Mr. President, I respectfully call attention to the fact that apparently the Attorney General has made a ruling that the Secretary of Commerce has the authority. If that is correct, the amendment would not be subject to a point of order. If the Secretary of Commerce has to get an opinion in addition, then the point of order would be well taken, because the amendment would be legislation on an appropriation bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I would argue in favor of the position of the committee, namely, that it is merely trying to clarify authority which the Secretary of Commerce already has.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair does not have before him at the moment the statute upon which the Attorney General may base his opinion, and the Chair cannot accept an opinion ex officio as having any binding force or validity upon a parliamentary point of order raised in connection with an amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The House language to which the amendment is offered deals only with the compensation of employees. The amendment deals with the power to purchase equipment. If the statute already provides that power, it is difficult to understand why the amendment is necessary, because it does not provide funds, but merely says the agency has the power to use for that purpose the funds already appropriated in this bill.

Unless there is something in the nature of a permanent statute, which does not appear on the surface of the bill, obviously the amendment would not be

in order to the bill, because in the bill there is nothing dealing with the purchase of equipment by the Inland Waterways Corporation or by any agency connected with it.

Therefore, the Chair feels constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may I point out to the Chair that the question which the Chair is relying upon is the point of germaneness, which the Chair is deciding for himself, in saying that this amendment is not in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Chair does not base his decision upon that.

Mr. LONG. I should like to point out to the Chair that, if there is legislation on an appropriation bill, the Chair would rule that it was out of order, in that it is legislation. Here, however, we have a case in which there is already House legislation, which is being amended, and, therefore, the point that this is legislation on an appropriation bill would not apply, unless it should happen that the Senate determined that it was not germane; and it would be the duty of the Chair at that point to submit the question of germaneness to the Senate, as a body, rather than to rule on the point directly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not understand that the point made was based on the question of germaneness, and the Chair did not base his decision upon the question of germaneness, but based it on the fact that it constitutes legislation, giving the Inland Waterways Commission power to purchase equipment, which is nowhere provided for in the bill, and which, so far as the Chair knows without further investigation, is not provided for in the present law.

Mr. LONG. Am I to understand that the Chair's ruling is that the section being amended does not contain general legislation? Because if that section, which came from the House, contained general legislation, then the Senate has the right to amend that section by further general legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not understand the rule to be that, if the House writes into an appropriation bill a legislative provision on a particular subject, the Senate can then provide for the whole field, adding to it legislation of all sorts. The Chair does not understand that to be either the rule or the practice of the Senate, and especially since it constitutes new legislation, not definitely in the House bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I point out that the House wrote in general legislation, and it is my impression that the Senate may amend that legislation with amendments which are germane, and that the question of germaneness is a question to be decided by the Senate, rather than a question for the Chair to decide directly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels that his ruling is correct, on the basis of the amendment being new legislation; and the question of germaneness was not one of the questions upon which the Chair undertook to pass.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if we have disposed of the point of order, I desire to call up an amendment which is on the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 27, line 3, after the word "further", it is proposed to restore the language stricken by the committee, to and including line 24, as follows:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949, (1) authorize during the fiscal year 1952 the commencement of construction of in excess of 5,000 dwelling units, or (2) after the date of approval of this act, enter into any agreement, contract, or other arrangement which will bind the Public Housing Administration with respect to loans, annual contributions, or authorizations for commencement of construction, for dwelling units aggregating in excess of 50,000 to be authorized for commencement of construction during any one fiscal year subsequent to the fiscal year 1952, unless a greater number of units is hereafter authorized by the Congress: *Provided further*, That the Public Housing Administration shall not, after the date of approval of this act, authorize the construction of any projects initiated before or after March 1, 1949, in any locality in which such projects have been or may hereafter be rejected by the governing body of the locality or by public vote, unless such projects have been subsequently approved by the same procedure through which such rejection was expressed.

And in line 25, to strike out the language to and including line 5, on page 28, as follows:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949, authorize during the fiscal year 1952 the commencement of construction of in excess of 50,000 dwelling units.

And on page 28, line 7, to strike out the committee amendment, "\$11,400,000" and restore the numerals "\$5,000,000."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if I may inquire, is it the Senator's desire to amend the provision regarding the Housing Administration, so that the provisions for the 5,000 units will be restored?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to congratulate the Senator. I am not for the amendment, but there have been many amendments proposed whose meaning I have never yet been able to understand exactly. But the Senator intends to cut the number from 50,000 to 5,000, directly. I am against the amendment. We had votes in the committee, as the Senator knows, upon two occasions, and in the subcommittee, to make it 50,000, which the House Appropriations Committee had made it, and to raise it from the House floor figure of 5,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Illinois is running.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to utilize a little of my own time in explaining this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senate will be patient for a moment, let me say that when the Eighty-first Congress passed the Act of July 15, 1949, it provided—

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. My time is running out.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator yield, upon the understanding that his time will not be running?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am agreeable, if it is not taken out of my time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time shall not be charged to the Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wonder whether the Senator wants a vote on his amendment this evening. The hour is getting late, and some Senators have left thinking the Senate was about to recess. The Senator from Illinois was recognized when I was trying to get the floor for that purpose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to present this matter for the moment, at least, and then come to a resolution of the Senator's question a little later, if he does not mind.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thought perhaps the Senator would rather discuss the amendment tomorrow. I had intended to move a recess.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the Eighty-first Congress, by the act of July 15, 1949, Congress authorized the construction of 810,000 public housing units, and those were to be divided up, with construction to begin on 135,000 units a year. So there is authority of Congress for 135,000 housing units a year for a period of 6 years. When the hearing was held by the House committee, witnesses indicated that, as of the first of March, they had under construction 34,356 units; that construction bids had been advertised for 47,514 units; and that loan and contributions contracts had been authorized for 116,592 units. So they were proceeding under the act of 1949, in due course.

Then out of a clear sky comes an Executive order; and what does that Executive order say? First of all, it limits the number of units for the last 6 months of 1950 to 30,000 units. The order further goes on to say that, for the 6 months' period beginning January 1, 1951, and for each 6 months' period thereafter, the limit should be 37,500 units. So, we have an Executive order which provides for 75,000 units a year, as against 135,000 a year, as authorized by Congress. In other words, the President cut the number down by 60,000 units a year.

There must have been some reason for that, and there was a reason. We have been dealing with this matter in the Senate for quite some time. The Federal Reserve Board indicated that in order to keep the inflationary pressure within manageable dimensions, the housing starts ought to be reduced from, roughly, 1,350,000 units in 1950 to 850,000 units in 1951; in other words, indicating that there should be a stoppage, by means of

credit regulations, of possibly 500,000 starts in 1951.

When this matter came before the House, the House committee limited the number to 50,000 units. An amendment was offered on the floor by Representative GOSSETT, of Texas, which cut it to 5,000, and his argument, which I think was a good one was that "If we are in war, and if on the one hand we have to watch our credit and watch our materials, then certainly on the other hand, we do not want to be authorizing the Government to undertake a life-sized housing program." In that amendment there was also a proviso that there should be no housing units constructed in an area or locality where there was public objection, unless it was done by a vote of the public body in that locality. That was the shape in which the matter came to the Senate. The bill provided for 5,000 starts, to take care of some bobtailed contracts, if there were any such. The Senate committee has restored the number to about 50,000.

I think we ought to readopt the House language, and I say that for a reason. All this construction is carried out under the 1949 act, which is a low-rent housing act. It is an act which calls for a subsidy, Mr. President, if you please, and yet, in the budget message, the President said he was going to use this authority for defense housing. He said:

To make sure that the full defense potentialities are realized, the Public Housing Administration, to the maximum extent feasible, will give preference to projects serving defense areas and will require local housing authorities to give military personnel and defense workers preference tenants.

That is precisely what the Federal Housing witnesses said when they came before the House committee. The quarrel I have is simply this, that we are to use the construction for defense housing—and it is a subsidy program—there will conceivably be persons living on one side of the street who work in a defense plant, and who pay their own rent without any help from the Government, and on the other side there will be persons working in the same plant, receiving the same pay, but receiving a gratuity or a subsidy under the program which is set forth in the President's budget message. That is indicated, of course, by testimony of housing officials.

I submit, Mr. President, that if the situation is as bad as we are told it is, and if the inflationary pressures are as bad as we are told they are, Congress has no business authorizing public housing units so long as it is possible for private enterprise to do the job. For that reason, I believe the House language should be restored, the administrative funds ought to be refined and reduced, and the Senate committee language ought to be deleted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think one statement which the Senator made is incorrect. He said that the defense workers would be subsidized. I do not approve the policy of permitting public housing to be used for defense workers. They have to pay the economic rent. There is no subsidy

for a defense worker. So the suggestion of the Senator that one man is subsidized, and another man earning the same amount is not subsidized, is not correct. A man who is a defense worker must pay the economic rent. He sometimes pays three times as much as does the other man.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Conceivably, he could be a defense worker and still not pay the economic rent in his area. He would be eligible for the same subsidy as would anyone else. That is what happens under the basic language of the law. I think it is unfair. I agree with the Senator from Ohio that the kind of housing proposed should not be used for defense purposes. That is a further argument for cutting down from 50,000 units to 5,000 units, as indicated by the amendment which was adopted in the House.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am shocked at the proposal made by the junior Senator from Illinois. I think 50,000 housing units would be too small a number. I want to increase the number—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is not propounding a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am seeking information from the Presiding Officer. I wish to increase the number of units from 50,000 to 60,000. I should like to be informed as to how that can be done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have not yielded for an inquiry.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, may I have a reply to my parliamentary inquiry?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks an amendment to the committee amendment would be in order. The amendment now offered by the Senator from Illinois is an amendment in the second degree. Therefore, the Senator from New York could not offer another amendment until the amendment of the Senator from Illinois had been disposed of; and it may depend on how it is disposed of whether he should offer it at all. He could not offer it as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Would it be in order to restore the amount the Senator from Illinois now wishes to change to the original sum mentioned in the bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the House provided a certain number of units, 5,000. The Senate committee amended the figure to 50,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Is this a motion to strike out and insert, or is it an attempt to defeat the committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment struck out and inserted, and the Senator from Illinois is seeking to restore the House language, which would involve the defeat of the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Was it a motion to strike out the committee amendment and insert?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the agreement, the committee amendments were all agreed to en bloc with the understanding that any Senator could move to amend a committee amendment even though it had been agreed to. The effect of the amendment would be to restore the 5,000 units provided in the House bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, another parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Is it in order for the Senator from New York to strike out "50,000" and insert "60,000" and have it passed on before the Dirksen amendment is passed on?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that an amendment would be in order changing the committee amendment from 50,000 to another figure, and it should first be voted on.

The Chair has recognized the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will yield for another parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the reason why I am asking for a ruling on this parliamentary question is that I do not want to be deprived by some parliamentary procedure from offering such an amendment. Do I correctly understand that at this time I may offer an amendment to increase the number of units from 50,000 to 60,000?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Whenever the Senator is recognized for that purpose, he may do so. But he cannot do it under the situation in which the Senator from Arizona yielded to him.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of enabling me to offer an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator?

Mr. FERGUSON. Reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that if this is accomplished the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will not be in order because it will be in the third degree?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. The effect of the amendment of the Senator from New York, if and when he shall offer it, will be to amend the committee amendment which the Senator from Illinois is seeking to have defeated so as to restore the original House figure. It

would take priority in the vote of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator offer an amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is my judgment that it would affect several pages and sections of the bill where money is provided for different purposes. I do not think that any amendment should be suggested in a hurry. I do not want to object to the Senator from New York attempting to accomplish his purpose, but it would take quite some time. I understood the Presiding Officer to say that the Senator could offer an amendment when he was recognized for that purpose.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, my reason for yielding was that the Senator from New York might have his amendment printed. I did not mean that the amendment would be discussed at this time. If the Senator will offer his amendment, it can be discussed tomorrow.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as the Senator from South Carolina has pointed out, the amendment which I propose to offer would undoubtedly affect several pages of the bill. So I would prefer not to offer it at this time, but I do not want to be estopped from offering it in due course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can offer it at any time before the amendment of the Senator from Illinois has been disposed of.

REGISTRATION OF AMERICAN SHIPS UNDER FOREIGN FLAGS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, relating to transfer of vessels documented under the laws of the United States to foreign citizens, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1704) to amend section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, relating to transfer of vessels documented under the laws of the United States to foreign citizens, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. O'CONNOR), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate, as I did last year and the year before, to the great number of foreign-flag-registry ships, not only American-owned ships, but ships of other countries as well. The Panamanian Merchant Marine today is the fourth largest in the world. It is exceeded only by that of the United States, Great Britain, and the Scandinavian countries.

Putting ships under Panamanian registry is a growing evil which involves tax evasion insofar as American corporations are concerned. It is a serious threat, of course, to our merchant marine, and we have no control over the situation. There are some serious legal

difficulties involved as to how we might put a stop to this practice, which may have to be worked out further.

The bill I am introducing now is the bill which the Senator from Maryland and I worked out last year, and which the committee unanimously passed. The bill was placed on the calendar.

Mr. President, in a recent trip I made to the Orient I found that much of the trade in Red China was being handled by ships flying the Panamanian flag. These ships never were in Panama. In 90 percent of the cases their crews do not even include a single Panamanian. The United Nations Economic Relations Pact, to which Panama is a signatory, provides for no control over the situation whatever.

The practice which our bill seeks to control however is one we should stop, and I hope we can stop it. I hope the bill may be the answer. It is the answer with respect to the ships over which the Maritime Board has control. The board has long ago, except in cases of rare emergency, followed the policy of not allowing the transfer of a ship to a foreign flag when we had some control over the ship, such as a mortgage, or where the line was a subsidized line. But the operators in question are independent operators. What they have done has caused a great deal of trouble, not only to all the other maritime nations of the world, but here at home.

Mr. President, surely the bill will take care of those ships over which we have control, but if it should not provide the way to stop the practice, I wish to attach to it, if I can, necessary amendments, in which the Senator from Maryland will join me, such as providing for a possible tax penalty on American capital or American corporations that expend their money for maritime building or maritime operations outside this country, and yet not fly the American flag.

Mr. President, the other day in Vermont, at a place called Island Pond, a Memorial Day address was delivered by the chairman of the National Americanism Commission of the American Legion, Mr. Crispe, which I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD, together with my remarks made when I introduced the bill last year.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACT FROM MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY
A. LUKE CRISPE, OF BRATTLEBORO, VT., CHAIRMAN,
NATIONAL AMERICANISM COMMISSION
OF THE AMERICAN LEGION AT ISLAND POND,
VT., MAY 30, 1951

Fellow Americans, today we again observe Memorial Day and pay homage and respect to all those who have answered the final call in the service of their country. This year this observance takes on added significance; for Americans are again engaged in battle in defense of democracy and freedom.

I have discussed the general menace of communism. There is, however, a very important aspect of which the American people should immediately take notice. Some years ago, Panama enacted legislation permitting foreign shipowners irrespective of residence to register their vessels with that government, thereby assuming Panamanian na-

tionality. The mechanics of this law are very simple: A shipowner need only to apply at the nearest Panamanian consulate and pay a small fee. From then on, he is entitled to fly the flag of Panama.

When the United States passed the original Neutrality Act, United States ships were forbidden from entering war zones. Because of this prohibition, some United States citizens, owners of vessels, immediately applied for Panamanian registration and were then free from the restrictions of the Neutrality Act. This practice has now developed into a most definite and serious threat. After the war, because many shipowners could save money by registering as Panamanian, great numbers of vessels were registered by citizens of many countries. As a result we now have a huge fleet flying the flag of Panama, having access to the ports of this country and the rest of the world.

Nevertheless, if all of the vessels flying the Panamanian flag were American owned, the problem would be rather simple. However, we must bear in mind that the Panamanian merchant marine is now among the big ten in the world and that actually a great majority of the vessels flying the Panamanian flag are of European and Asiatic origin.

The practice of Panamanian registration developed about 20 years ago when a few countries couldn't get an American registration or certificate. From that time on it has developed into an international octopus with all sorts of tentacles. Shippers have used it to smuggle contraband goods, narcotics and opium. The Panamanian Government knows only that they have registered a ship, received a fee, and sent somebody some registration papers. The ships, of course, may operate anywhere, but a great majority of them never see the shores of Panama. The Panamanian Government doesn't know anything about the ship it registers, its traffic, officers, crew or business. On 90 percent of these vessels there isn't even one Panamanian citizen.

The tonnage of the Panamanian merchant marine runs into several million tons. About one-sixth of the total tonnage is Russian owned or owned by countries behind the iron curtain. The crews of these Russian-controlled vessels number Communists of all nationalities, yet they are allowed free access to the ports of the United States. It may not be far-fetched to say that the greatest threat of a Russian atomic explosion may be a Panamanian ship.

The crews of these ships are often interrogated by our port and police authorities, but invariably the pattern has been one of silence which typifies the well-indoctrinated "Commie." The fact that the ship may be owned by some European corporation is not always a test of its genuineness for there is evidence that many of the holding companies licensed by countries in continental Europe are controlled either by Russia or its satellites. These holding companies are as fraudulent as the ship's right to fly the flag of a Central American country.

Although we must recognize that we have no jurisdiction over the Government of Panama, nevertheless it is our responsibility to bring about a full disclosure of this menace. The question immediately arises as to how many of these ships are actually owned and controlled by Americans? How many are owned and controlled by Russia and her satellites? What cargoes do they transport? Is our Government fully cognizant of the Communist-manned ships? What so-called Americans are flying the Panamanian flag to betray our boys in Korea by trading with the enemy?

You and I cannot answer these questions, but our Government can conduct an investigation and give us the answers. There is now pending before the Congress a bill,

introduced by Senator MAGNUSON, of Washington, which would prohibit American-owned ships from transferring their registration to Panama. The bill is in committee and is receiving thoughtful study. However, this Senate Committee not only has a great responsibility but a great opportunity to investigate all phases of this problem.

The work of the House Un-American Activities Committee, which I have mentioned in discussing communism with you today has been of tremendous service to our country. Then, too, we have had the recent so-called Kefauver investigation which has resulted in the conviction and imprisonment of various gangsters and phony politicians. These two committees have demonstrated that the investigative power of Congress can be of tremendous service to the Nation. Therefore, I feel that it is incumbent upon the Congress and the committee studying the Magnuson bill to immediately launch a full and complete investigation so that the questions which I have propounded may be answered. The American people are entitled to know whether some of these Panamanian-registered ships are Russian couriers engaged in espionage and ready for sabotage. We are entitled to know whether American-owned vessels flying the Panamanian flag are furnishing supplies and ammunition to the enemy. I am sure that once this knowledge is brought to the attention of the American people we can find a remedy to deal at least with those American citizens who betray our boys in Korea. Publicity alone would tend to discourage the American citizen from dealing directly or indirectly with the Red Chinese or other Communist, for our recent investigations have demonstrated the power of publicity and the American, owning ships flying the Panamanian flag and dealing with the enemy, knows the price that he will pay in the loss of commerce and business here at home.

The dangers of Russian-controlled Panamanian vessels can be dealt with by adequate security regulations.

REGISTRATION OF AMERICAN SHIPS UNDER FOREIGN FLAGS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduced for appropriate reference a bill. It is introduced on behalf of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I desire to call the attention of the Senate to an evil which has arisen in the maritime industry of the world, namely, the registration of ships under Panamanian and other foreign registries, which operates to the detriment of the employment of our seamen. It also involves a tax evasion on the part of many American citizens who build ships here, or at other places throughout the world, and then register them under the Panamanian flag. It is an evil which we hope we shall be able to eradicate.

There is a most difficult legal question involved, but it surely is one which must be dealt with if we are to keep an adequate merchant marine flying the American flag. I call attention particularly to the fact that the language of the bill is not entirely perfect, because of legal questions involved. However, we hope to have immediate hearings on the bill. We are open to suggestions. Our real objective is to eradicate the evil referred to.

The bill (S. 3823) to amend section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, relating to transfer of vessels documented under the laws of the United States to foreign citizens and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SAVING IN THE PRICE OF TIN—ARTICLE BY CHARLES LUCEY

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. During the past several days we have been working in an attempt to achieve greater economy in government. I notice that on some occasions we have spent hours in considering amendments which might save as much as \$3,000. Therefore it is gratifying to notice that there are several committees of the Senate which are saving the taxpayers of the Nation a great deal of money, without legislation ever coming to the floor.

I have particularly in mind the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services. Excellent work is being done in that committee by its members, particularly by the chairman, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

I hold in my hand an article in which it is explained how, largely because of the work of that preparedness subcommittee, the price of tin has been greatly reduced, and that the Government of the United States in its stockpiling program will save many millions of dollars, possibly hundreds of millions. I ask that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIN CARTELS TAKE A LICKING—UNITED STATES GETS TOUGH AND SAVES MONEY

(By Charles Lucey)

Tough action by the United States is beginning to break the back of price-gouging foreign monopolies on strategic materials. The campaign is to save this country hundreds of millions of dollars.

Three months ago this Government, tired of being held up by British, Dutch, Belgian and Bolivian tin cartels, pulled out of the world market as a buyer and decided to make a fight of it.

In these 3 months tin prices have tumbled from nearly \$2 a pound to \$1.11. The foreign tin producers have panicked.

And the United States is telling them that if they want to sell tin they'd better get the price down even more.

Credit for this seems to go chiefly to Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of a Senate Preparedness Subcommittee which built a hot fire under the administration; RFC Chairman Stuart Symington and Donald C. Cook, the subcommittee's chief counsel.

WEARY TAXPAYER

On February 12 the subcommittee, in a detailed report on tin, said:

"The American taxpayer is weary of being gouged for the privilege of obtaining from some of its allies the raw materials with which he is expected to supply the food and armament needs of the non-Communist nations in the event of another all-out war. And this committee intends to do whatever it can to put an end to that gouging."

The ceiling price on tin in World War II had been only 52 cents a pound. In May 1950 the price was 76 cents. But the Korean war gave the tin producers a lever to shove prices up and they did—to about \$2 in February.

Tin was coming into the United States both as metal and in concentrates—the latter to be smelted at the Texas City, Tex., tin

smelter operated by the RFC. The RFC bought all the tin that came from overseas, and sold it as needed to United States industry.

RFC DROPS PRICE

After the Senate committee report, the RFC dropped its tin price from \$1.82 to \$1.57 and then to \$1.34. This meant the United States no longer was tied to the world-controlling Singapore tin price. The Singapore price followed downward at first but then, perhaps "feeling out" the United States, moved higher again.

At one point the RFC, paying more for tin than it was selling it for to United States industry, wavered and shoved its selling price upward—and promptly drew a severe rebuke from Senator JOHNSON. Then, on March 6, the United States decided it could stop buying tin for its stockpile without prejudicing national security, and this decision, plus the earlier pressure, at last got tin prices in Singapore and London rolling downward in earnest.

On April 12 the Singapore price was \$1.50, the RFC price was \$1.47. By May 31 both prices were \$1.39. On June 1 the RFC pulled its price to \$1.36, and Singapore went to \$1.32. Then RFC went down to \$1.29 and so did Singapore. RFC led down to \$1.23, and Singapore followed. Last Thursday the Singapore price went to \$1.18, and the RFC cut its price to the same level. Friday Singapore went to \$1.11, and so did the RFC. This was an 18-cent tumble in 4 days.

CANCELLATION THREAT

After the RFC stopped buying tin for the stockpile, the only tin coming into the United States was that which had been contracted for under long-term contract. These contracts carried a clause saying that if the tin price was above \$1.03 they could be canceled on June 30 of this year.

The Senate committee had recommended cancellation, and the Government decided now to do that. Nothing has been announced about it, but a notice of intent to cancel went out to Singapore. It could have reached there toward the end of last week—when prices really began to tumble.

All of this has caused much wringing of hands by the tin producers, and the State Department, always intent on keeping our overseas allies happy, has passed on their protests.

The United States, world's biggest tin user, chews up about 135,000,000 pounds a year. The price tumble since February, applied to that, represents more than \$100,000,000. And, although detailed figures can't be disclosed in relation to this country's tin stockpile, the saving could be several hundred millions there.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER OUTPUT—ARTICLE BY CHARLES LUCEY

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I also have another article along the same line, relating to the savings in the stockpiling program of rubber, as well as the synthetic rubber program, in connection with which the same Senate Preparedness Subcommittee has also done very excellent work. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATURAL RUBBER PRICES DECLINE—STEPPED-UP SYNTHETIC RUBBER OUTPUT IS SAVING MILLIONS FOR UNCLE SAM

(By Charles Lucey)

Production of synthetic rubber is moving toward full capacity and is helping to drive down rubber prices so effectively as to rep-

resent hundreds of millions of dollars in savings for this country.

That's the word from the Senate Preparedness Committee headed by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON (Democrat, Texas), which criticized Government rubber policies a few months ago and is now preparing a new report on this strategic commodity.

The report may make at least two important recommendations: Get a tougher rubber conservation program and build more synthetic-rubber plants to decrease United States dependency on overseas rubber sources.

NOT QUITE AS GOOD

No synthetic rubber produced yet is as good for all purposes as natural rubber—for the biggest, heavy-duty truck tires, for example—and so this country must import and stockpile natural rubber. Ninety-five percent of it comes from the Far East. The United States lost this source during World War II, and it could happen again. Hence, the committee says, this country must have adequate natural-rubber stockpiles and increasing synthetic capacity.

After World War II the United States had a synthetic-rubber capacity of 830,000 tons a year. But synthetic plants were closed down to a point where output was only about 300,000 tons. Senate committee officials place some blame for this curtailment on the State Department. The Department, they say, favored British, Dutch, and other natural-rubber producers who wished to sell more rubber here.

At one time in the postwar period, the United States was making synthetic rubber at a profit for about 18 cents a pound, and the natural-rubber price dipped to 16-17 cents. But when the Korean war started, natural-rubber prices began to climb. By last September they had reached 50 cents a pound; by January the level reached about 70 cents, and at one point was headed toward 90 cents.

FAILED TO MAKE HAY

Yet, according to the Senate committee, when the natural-rubber price slid below 20 cents, the Government wasn't stockpiling. There were big United States rubber imports, but they were going mostly to the rubber industry. Later on, though, Government stockpiled at much higher prices.

Rubber can be bought now for about 49 cents a pound, or 26 cents under the February price, and the view of Donald C. Cook, Senate Preparedness Committee counsel, is that the United States action in building up synthetic output is largely responsible.

The United States uses about 500,000 tons of natural rubber a year. Applying the price decline of recent months to this would run to more than \$200,000,000. And Mr. Cook's view is that the price would have been much higher if the United States had not stepped up its synthetic production.

THAT'S NOT ALL

At the time the committee first protested, the Government actually had been considering disposing of a 30,000-ton-a-year capacity plant at Akron.

But the saving growing from forcing down natural-rubber prices isn't the whole saving. The substitution of greater quantities of synthetic rubber, made possible by the increased production program, means more savings. The Government is selling synthetic now at 24½ cents a pound. That's about half what natural rubber costs today. Savings could run to a pile of millions here again.

There seems to be continuing good news ahead on rubber prices for the consumer, if there's no bigger war. Future deliveries are being scheduled at 43 cents, 6 cents under current quotations.

The Senate committee said months ago it had found that "Government agencies responsible for our rubber supply and stockpile have been slow to adjust their thinking to and actions to the realities of the post-Korean world." The coming Senate report on rubber may give credit for progress made, but is fairly sure, too, to demand still more aggressive action to cushion possible loss of overseas rubber sources in future days.

THE 1952 BUDGET AND INTERNAL REVENUE COLLECTIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a breakdown of the \$71,250,000,000 budget that has been proposed for this year. There is a breakdown by States, showing the proportionate part each State will pay. At the same time there is shown how much was collected by the Internal Revenue Bureau for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State	Total internal revenue collections for fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 ¹	Proportionate part to be paid toward the \$71½ billion budget
Alabama.....	\$233,208,454	\$427,500,000
Arizona.....	74,822,094	135,375,000
Arkansas.....	105,425,486	192,375,000
California.....	2,794,713,395	5,108,625,000
Colorado.....	272,505,614	498,750,000
Connecticut.....	592,874,470	1,083,000,000
Delaware.....	356,901,157	655,500,000
Florida.....	359,387,115	655,500,000
Georgia.....	392,518,088	719,625,000
Idaho.....	71,828,836	128,250,000
Illinois.....	3,396,892,658	6,213,000,000
Indiana.....	973,283,542	1,781,250,000
Iowa.....	345,223,492	634,125,000
Kansas.....	307,923,529	562,875,000
Kentucky.....	857,689,175	1,567,500,000
Louisiana.....	350,570,822	641,250,000
Maine.....	106,910,352	192,375,000
Maryland.....	1,128,476,407	2,066,250,000
Massachusetts.....	1,127,641,137	2,059,125,000
Michigan.....	2,747,570,685	5,023,125,000
Minnesota.....	629,726,416	1,154,250,000
Mississippi.....	88,306,655	163,875,000
Missouri.....	1,102,085,135	2,016,375,000
Montana.....	74,864,365	135,375,000
Nebraska.....	261,366,873	477,375,000
Nevada.....	35,446,339	64,125,000
New Hampshire.....	68,755,337	128,250,000
New Jersey.....	1,133,975,046	2,073,375,000
New Mexico.....	57,906,231	106,875,000
New York.....	7,215,466,535	13,195,500,000
North Carolina.....	1,131,446,603	2,066,250,000
North Dakota.....	52,054,181	92,625,000
Ohio.....	2,435,890,906	4,453,125,000
Oklahoma.....	413,470,362	755,250,000
Oregon.....	262,968,480	484,500,000
Pennsylvania.....	2,964,381,617	5,422,125,000
Rhode Island.....	183,795,663	334,875,000
South Carolina.....	175,019,823	320,625,000
South Dakota.....	56,717,659	106,875,000
Tennessee.....	316,035,571	577,125,000
Texas.....	1,290,822,384	2,358,375,000
Utah.....	84,012,613	156,750,000
Vermont.....	37,110,077	71,250,000
Virginia.....	744,061,228	1,360,875,000
Washington.....	444,759,395	812,250,000
West Virginia.....	203,917,245	370,500,000
Wisconsin.....	758,371,637	1,389,375,000
Wyoming.....	37,425,839	71,250,000
Alaska.....	17,393,930	28,500,000
Hawaii.....	81,400,813	149,625,000
Puerto Rico.....	2,320,274	7,125,000

¹ From report of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, Treasury Department, released Aug. 23, 1950.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1951—STATEMENT BY ERLE COCKE, JR.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand the President has signed the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, the manpower bill, which

contains the universal military training and service provisions. I desire at this time to compliment the commander of the American Legion, Erle Cocke, Jr., for the splendid work he did in behalf of the bill. No one worked harder and more diligently to secure UMT legislation than did the commander of the American Legion. He worked for it because he felt it was necessary for the defense of our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by Commander Cocke dealing with the subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ERLE COCKE, JR., NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, COINCIDENT WITH THE SIGNING INTO LAW OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1951, JUNE 19, 1951

Universal military training was first advocated by the American Legion in 1919. The organization has fought for it without let-up ever since.

The 1919 resolution adopted at the Legion's first national convention, called for "a policy of universal military training (with) administration, removed from the complete control of any exclusively military caste." The American Legion stands for that policy today.

The measure signed into law today sets up a series of steps by which the Congress must decide finally whether the Nation is to have an operating UMT program. We believe a clear majority of Americans made up their minds long ago, and affirmatively. We intend to use every means at our disposal to convey that majority opinion to Congress.

While postponement of the final decision is regrettable and unnecessary, I am convinced that the additional study and detailed training curriculum to be initiated by the National Security Training Commission will serve to strengthen and solidify the public support UMT has enjoyed since the end of World War II.

The opposition has been whittled over the years by enlightened understanding of the need for a system of youth training under civilian control and within predictable costs. It remains centered today where it has always been—in a small but loud handful of pacifists and chronic critics who are for national security but against the measures that would make the Nation secure.

The American Legion had introduced into the Congress last January Senate bill 1. That bill provided for a program of UMT, to go into operation after the end of the present national emergency. The measure signed into law today was S. 1 as amended to strengthen the draft and set up the preliminaries of UMT.

Twenty-eight years elapsed before UMT legislation won approval of a committee of the Congress. Now, another 4 years later, the Senate and House have agreed to settle the issue once and for all in the reasonably near future.

The Universal Military Training and Service Act is an important victory—although a limited one—for realistic preparedness. The American people owe a great deal to the leaders of vision and courage, particularly Senator Richard Russell, Senator Lyndon Johnson, Senator Styles Bridges, Senator Harry Cain, Representative Carl Vinson, Representative Overton Brooks, Representative W. Sterling Cole, Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall, and the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, who fought this legislation through.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Fifteen postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Paul W. Brosman, of Louisiana, to be judge of the Court of Military Appeals for the term expiring May 1, 1956.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to state briefly that we of Louisiana are very much honored by the appointment of Dr. Paul W. Brosman to the Court of Military Appeals. Dr. Brosman has a very eminent and distinguished record as dean of the Tulane Law School. He has been a distinguished citizen of Louisiana for many years. We believe that no finer jurist could have been appointed by the President.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George W. Latimer, of Utah, to be judge of the Court of Military Appeals for the term expiring May 1, 1961.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, Judge Latimer has rendered outstanding service to the Nation through 26 years of military service with the Utah National Guard and the Army of the United States. He has served the State of Utah well as a justice of the Utah State Supreme Court. He has the universal approval of the bench and bar of the State of Utah.

Judge Latimer practiced law in his home State for 15 years prior to entering active military service. While in the service he was awarded the Legion of Merit for service in combat in New Britain and the Philippines.

While Judge Latimer was recommended by Republicans and the Republicans are proud that he is a member of the party, he has received the support of members of both parties. The enlisted men and the men in the ranks of the Army of the United States will find in Justice Latimer a man who has risen through those ranks and who therefore is sympathetic to them and their problems.

Utahans are proud of Judge Latimer and are confident that he will fill with dignity, ability, and distinction the office to which he has been appointed.

I have a short memorandum giving the details of Judge Latimer's military, professional, and legal activities. I request that it be printed at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY SERVICE

Col. George W. Latimer has had approximately 26 years' military service with the Utah National Guard and the Army of the United States. He enrolled in the Reserve Officers Training Corps, University of Utah, and attended a basic camp at Camp Knox in 1920 and an advance course at Fort Lewis, Wash., in 1922. In 1924 he graduated as a second lieutenant of field artillery. The year after he accepted a commission in the National Guard, and has served that organization in all ranks from second lieutenant to colonel. In 1926 he was ordered to and graduated from the Battery Officers Course, Fort Sill, Okla. He was selected to attend the Ninth Corps Area Command and General Staff School in 1938 and 1939, but this course was discontinued. In 1940 he was selected to attend the first special course, Command and General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and upon his completion the school requested he be detailed there as instructor. He was inducted into the Federal service February 1941 as G-1 of the Fortieth Infantry Division. He subsequently was promoted to a full colonel, became chief of staff of this division, and served in that capacity while the division was in Hawaii, Guadalcanal, New Britain, and Luzon, Negros and Panay, Philippine Islands. During the years 1944-45 this division was engaged in combat in the areas above mentioned. Since being relieved from active duty late in 1945, Colonel Latimer was selected for duty with the General Staff in Washington, D. C., but was unable to accept the assignment because of his election to the supreme court, State of Utah. In 1948-49 he accepted two short tours of duty with the Army Field Forces, Fort Monroe, Va. He supervised the National Guard officers in the preparation of National Guard training programs and staff-training programs.

PROFESSIONAL AND LEGAL SERVICE

Justice Latimer graduated from the University of Utah Law School with an L. L. B. in 1924. He practiced law in Salt Lake City, Utah, from 1925 until 1940. In the latter year he discontinued his practice because of having been ordered into the military service. He returned to general practice in the State of Utah in the latter part of 1945, and remained in the practice until he was elected to the supreme court of the State of Utah in November 1946. He has served 4½ years of a 10-year term, and he is regarded by the people of the State of Utah as an eminent jurist and hard working public servant.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD several editorials from Utah newspapers, as well as a resolution passed unanimously, by the legislature of the State of Utah, congratulating Judge Latimer upon his appointment, and pointing out his many fine qualifications, as well as congratulating the President upon making such a wonderful choice.

There being no objection, the editorials and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Deseret News, Salt Lake City, Utah, of May 24, 1951]

UTAH JURIST NAMED TO HIGH FEDERAL POST

Utah has again been honored by the choice of one of its eminent jurists for Federal appointment to a high appellate court. Justice George W. Latimer of the Supreme Court of Utah has been named by President Truman for a post on the new Federal Court of Military Appeals.

This is a newly constituted court, consisting of three civilian judges of adequate experience and specialized knowledge, set up under the new program of unification of the Armed Forces. Its duties are to review the findings of military courts, on proper appeal, and its rank is on a par with a United States Circuit Court of Appeals with civilian jurisdiction.

In accepting this post, Justice Latimer will join a list of illustrious Utahans who hold or have held high Federal appellate posts. Most noteworthy was the late Justice George Sutherland, British-born but Utah-raised, who was Senator from Utah and later for 16 years was a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Judge Harold M. Stephens is chief justice of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and Judge Florence E. Allen, a member of the Sixth Court of Appeals which has jurisdiction in Ohio and adjacent States, was born and raised here in Salt Lake City.

Utah feels that it shares the honor of Justice Latimer's appointment, and wishes him the fullest measure of success in his new and responsible post.

[From the Salt Lake Telegram of May 24, 1951]

JUDICIAL HONOR

Utahans will be pleased over the nomination of George W. Latimer, justice of the State supreme Court, by President Truman for the Republican post on a new Court of Military Appeals. Judge Latimer's name has been sent to the Senate for confirmation, and approval seems certain.

Justice Latimer has served on the Utah Supreme Court for more than 4 years. A native of this State and a graduate of the University of Utah Law School, he practiced law in this city from 1924 until he entered military service in 1940. Service in the ROTC at the university and in the Utah National Guard put him well up the ranks in the army and he came out of the war a full colonel, having served as chief of staff of an infantry division in the Pacific.

The Military Appeals Courts to which Judge Latimer and two Democrats have been nominated is a new tribunal of civilian jurists set up under the Armed Forces unification program to serve as a final court of appeals for serious military cases. Under normal circumstances judges will serve 15-year terms, although initial terms are staggered, that of Justice Latimer being for 10 years.

It is a position of real judicial and military importance to which George Latimer has been named. It is an honor to him and to this State. The Telegram congratulates him and wishes him well in the new position which we are sure will soon become definitely his as the result of senatorial confirmation.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of May 24, 1951]

AN EXCELLENT APPOINTMENT

Beginning June 1 a new system of military justice will go in effect for the Armed Forces designed to give servicemen accused of major

offenses fairer treatment and more of the legal protection they would have received in civilian life. The new system, latest step in the unification program, broadens court-marital procedure and in addition provides for appeals to a three-man court of civilian judges. Decisions of the appeals court will be final in all cases except those involving the death penalty, where the president will retain the last say.

President Truman has nominated Justice George W. Latimer of the Utah Supreme Court as a member of the new military tribunal. The choice is excellent. Since his graduation from the University of Utah Law School in 1924 Justice Latimer has been a respected member of the bar. In 1947 he became a member of the Utah Supreme Court, where his wide knowledge of the law and his judicial temperament have been much in evidence. He has long been interested in military affairs and for many years was a member of the national guard. During World War II he served with the Army in the Pacific, participated in three campaigns and was awarded the legion of merit. He left the service as a colonel, a rank he now holds in the national guard.

Justice Latimer's appointment is a signal honor for Utah. But, more than that, it is a great break for the Armed Services. He will bring to his new position (confirmation by the Senate should be a mere formality) a military background and a soldier's viewpoint, combined with marvelous judicial temperament and training in civilian law. These are qualities which will assure success to the new system of military justice.

Senate Joint Resolution 4

Joint resolution congratulating Justice George W. Latimer upon his appointment as a justice of the United States Court of Military Appeals

Whereas the President of the United States of America has seen fit to appoint Justice George W. Latimer of the Supreme Court of the State of Utah to the office of Justice of the United States Court of Military Appeals; and

Whereas Justice Latimer has served with distinction and honor as a member of the bar and the bench of this State, and as an officer in the Army of the United States, and the National Guard of the State of Utah; and

Whereas the people of the State of Utah regret to lose the services of such an able jurist and humble, friendly soul, but rejoice in the great honor which has come to Justice Latimer and to the State of Utah: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah in session assembled, That Justice George W. Latimer be congratulated upon his appointment as Justice of the United States Court of Military Appeals; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Justice George W. Latimer and to the President of the United States and the Senate of the United States of America, and Utah delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I take pleasure in associating myself with the senior Senator from Utah in his representation in behalf of Judge Latimer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination of George W. Latimer of Utah is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert Emmett Quinn of Rhode Island, to be judge of the Court of Mil-

tary Appeals for the term expiring May 1, 1966.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I have been requested to ask that the nomination of Irving Florman, of New York to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia, go over. I ask that that nomination be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over. Without objection, the other nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service will be confirmed en bloc.

That completes the nominations on the calendar.

Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

CONSIDERATION OF ROUTINE NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, from the Armed Services Committee, I report 1,736 nominations in the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

In order to avoid printing these names in the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be confirmed and that the President be notified.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I think it would be well for the Senator to say what I know to be the fact, that the Committee on Armed Services unanimously reported all these nominations, and that some of them are of immediate necessity?

Mr. CAIN. To my knowledge every member of the committee voted in support of all the 1,700-odd nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nominations? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement in support of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, six of the officers nominated for promotion are with our Army in Korea. Brig. Gen. Joseph S. Bradley, nominated for appointment as a major general, is commanding the Twenty-fifth Infantry Division in Korea.

The five colonels, Champeny, Watson, Ennis, de Shazo, and Guthrie, nominated for appointment as brigadier generals, are all in Korea. These officers have won their promotions on the field of battle.

One of the officers, Gen. Arthur S. Champeny, is a combat veteran of World War I, World War II, and of the far eastern war I, in Korea. This officer is deserving of a particular word of attention and compliment. He has been decorated with the Distinguished Service

Cross in each of three wars, which cover a period of 33 years. I know of no other individual in the United States Army who has so often through so many years exposed himself in defense of and for the good of his Nation to the weapons and ruthlessness of his Nation's enemies. General Champeny has given of his blood, strength, courage and heart for the common welfare. The Senator from Washington, for himself and others, most humbly expresses his gratefulness to this fighting American.

General Champeny was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the Nation's second highest combat award, for gallantry in action with the Eighty-ninth Division in World War I. During World War II, he commanded the Three Hundred and Fifty-first Infantry Regiment of the Eighty-eighth Division in Italy. While in command of his regiment he was awarded an oak leaf cluster to the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star, and the Bronze Star Medal for heroism in action, and was awarded the Purple Heart, with three oak leaf clusters, for wounds received during this period. General Champeny commanded the Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment of the Twenty-fifth Division during the early days of the fighting in Korea. He was awarded the second oak leaf cluster to the Distinguished Service Cross for extraordinary heroism while in command of this regiment in Korea. He was wounded twice during this period. Other decorations awarded General Champeny are the Legion of Merit, with oak leaf cluster, and two oak leaf clusters to the Bronze Star Medal.

As Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway has said with such justification and faith—and it applies with equal force to General Champeny—"If it be life that waits, then I shall live forever, unconquered."

RECESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 20, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 19 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

James W. Wadsworth, of New York, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission for a term of 3 years, expiring June 19, 1954.

Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid, United States Navy, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission for a term of 4 years, expiring June 19, 1955.

Lt. Gen. Raymond S. McLain, United States Army, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission for a term of 5 years, expiring June 19, 1956.

The following-named persons to be members of the National Security Training Commission for terms of 2 years, expiring June 19, 1953:

William L. Clayton, of Texas.

Karl T. Compton, of Massachusetts.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 19 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

THE COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

Paul W. Brosman, of Louisiana, to be a judge of the Court of Military Appeals for the term expiring May 1, 1966.

George W. Latimer, of Utah, to be a judge of the Court of Military Appeals for the term expiring May 1, 1961.

Robert Emmett Quinn, of Rhode Island, to be a judge of the Court of Military Appeals for the term expiring May 1, 1966.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

AMBASSADORS EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Cuba.

John C. Wiley, of Indiana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Panama.

ROUTINE APPOINTMENTS

To be Foreign Service officers of class 1

Ware Adams	George Lewis Jones, Jr.
John M. Allison	Cecil B. Lyon
Charles F. Baldwin	Paul O. Nyhus
Donald F. Bigelow	Edward Page, Jr.
Sidney H. Browne	Donald W. Smith
Charles R. Burrows	William P. Snow
John Davies, Jr.	Philip D. Sprouse
Owen L. Dawson	Francis Bowden Stevens
Charles E. Dickerson, Jr.	Tyler Thompson
Walter C. Dowling	William C. Trimble
C. Burke Elbrick	Walter N. Walmsley, Jr.
Walton C. Ferris	Joe D. Walstrom
Andrew B. Foster	Miss Frances E. Willis
Norris S. Haselton	
U. Alexis Johnson	

To be Foreign Service officers of class 2

William K. Ailshie	Bertel E. Kuniholm
Frederic P. Bartlett	Rufus H. Lane, Jr.
Burton Y. Berry	Patrick Mallon
Clarence E. Birgfeld	Gordon H. Mattison
Ralph J. Blake	Edward D. McLaughlin
Ralph A. Boernstein	Robert B. Memminger
Niles W. Bond	George A. Morgan
Elmer H. Bourgerie	John H. Morgan
Aaron S. Brown	Brewster H. Morris
Robert Y. Brown	Robert Newbegin
Prescott Childs	William C. Ockey
Claude Courand	Marselis C. Parsons, Jr.
Cabot Coville	Troy L. Perkins
Howard Elting, Jr.	C. Montagu Pigott
Jerome T. Gaspard	Paul J. Reveley
Eugene A. Gilmore, Jr.	Arthur R. Ringwalt
Bernard Guffler	Andreas G. Ronhovde
Edmund A. Gullion	Albert W. Scott
Theodore J. Hadraba	Charles Nelson Spinks
John J. Haggerty	Robert B. Streeper
John N. Hamlin	E. Paul Tenney
Parker T. Hart	Charles W. Thayer
James E. Henderson	Sheldon Thomas
L. Randolph Higgs	Frederik van den Arend
John A. Hopkins	Woodruff Wallner
Morris N. Hughes	Milton K. Wells
Fred W. Jandrey	Clifton R. Wharton
Perry N. Jester	Evan M. Wilson
Howard P. Jones	
Erwin P. Keeler	
William L. Kilcoin	

To be Foreign Service officers of class 3

William C. Affeld, Jr.	John H. Burns
H. Gardner Ainsworth	Frank P. Butler
Edward Anderson	Donald B. Calder
Leonard Lee Bacon	Turner C. Cameron, Jr.
N. Spencer Barnes	Robert J. Cavanaugh
James D. Bell	V. Lansing Collins, Jr.
Carl Breuer	Harry Conover
Willard O. Brown	Austin B. Cox
Glen W. Bruner	

Robert C. Creel	Ernest de W. Mayer
Glion Curtis, Jr.	David H. McKillop
Philip M. Davenport	John M. McSweeney
Joseph L. Dougherty	John Gordon Mein
Perry Ellis	Robert G. Miner
Robert B. Elwood	H. Gordon Minningode
Frederick E. Farnsworth	Charles H. Owsley
Robert S. Folsom	Paul Paddock
Paul E. Geier	J. Hall Paxton
Lewis E. Gleeck, Jr.	Kennett F. Potter
Richard E. Gnade	Henry C. Ramsey
Bartley P. Gordon	Halleck L. Rose
Caspar D. Green	Edward J. Rowell
Robert Grinnell	Roy Richard Rubottom, Jr.
Claude H. Hall, Jr.	M. Robert Rutherford
Wesley C. Haraldson	William Langdon Sands
Walter W. Hoffmann	Richard M. Service
John B. Holt	Harold Sims
Richard S. Huestis	Henry T. Smith
Hartwell Johnson	Henry W. Spielman
Sidney K. Lafoon	Paul J. Sturm
Frederick P. Latimer, Jr.	Horace G. Torbert, Jr.
Raymond G. Leddy	Murat W. Williams
F. Ridgway Lineaweaver	David G. Wilson, Jr.
Walter J. Linthicum	William Witman 2d
Raymond E. Lisle	

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4

Robert J. Dorr	Edward F. Rivinus, Jr.
David I. Ferber	Randolph Roberts
Deane R. Hinton	Robert Rossow, Jr.
Oscar C. Holder	Sheldon B. Vance
Walter C. Isenberg, Jr.	Edward L. Waggoner
Leslie W. Johnson	Fred E. Waller
Weldon Litsey	Meredith Weatherby
Henry L. Pitts, Jr.	Charles H. Whitaker

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4 and consuls

Robert W. Adams	Samuel Owen Lane
Robert G. Bailey	Armistead M. Lee
Milton Barall	Scott Lyon
Taylor G. Belcher	George Hubert Maness
Donald C. Bergus	Oliver M. Marcy
Robert O. Blake	David E. Mark
Thomas D. Bowie	Edward N. McCully
John W. Bowling	Thomas W. McElhiney
Robert A. Brand	Thomas D. McKiernan
Howard Brandon	Cleveland B. McKnight
Gray Bream	Lee E. Metcalf
Clarence T. Breaux	Joseph J. Montlor
William L. Brewster	Robert W. Moore
Lewis D. Brown	Andrew E. Olson
Miss Lora C. Bryning	Clinton L. Olson
Rolland H. Bushner	W. Paul O'Neill, Jr.
Wilbur P. Chase	Alexander L. Peaslee
Keld Christensen	Norman K. Pratt
Charles Philip Clock	Lubert O. Sanderhoff
A. John Cope, Jr.	Rufus Z. Smith
Robert F. Corrigan	Herbert D. Spivack
Roy T. Davis, Jr.	Wells Stabler
Alexander J. Davit	Charles G. Stefan
Juan de Zengotita	Gerald Stryker
Dwight Dickinson	John H. Stutesman, Jr.
Donald P. Downs	John L. Topping
Thomas J. Duffield, Jr.	Temple Wanamaker
L. Milner Dunn	H. André Weismann
William J. Ford	Jackson W. Wilson
Martin F. Herz	
William P. Hudson	
Alfred le S. Jenkins	
Joseph J. Jova	
William C. Lakeland	

To be Foreign Service officers of class 5

Theo C. Adams	Robert A. Aylward
Thomas W. Ainsworth	William M. Bates
Willard Allan	Robert M. Berry
Arthur B. Allen	Slator C. Blackiston, Jr.
James F. Amory	James J. Blake
John C. Amott	Vincent R. Boening
Alfred L. Atherton, Jr.	Howard L. Boorman
John Campbell	William D. Brewster
Ausland	Robert C. Brewster
Philip Axelrod	William B. Buffum

Miss Patricia M. Byrne	Francis N. Maglozzi
Stuart B. Campbell, Jr.	Philip W. Manhard
William C. Canup	Eugene V. McAuliffe
Frank E. Cash, Jr.	Richard M. McCarthy
Ralph G. Clark	Glenn R. McCarty, Jr.
S. Wilson Clark	Stephen H. McClintic
Stephen A. Comiskey	James H. McFarland, Jr.
Thomas J. Corcoran	Joseph F. McFarland
Henry L. Coster	John B. McGrath
Richard H. Courtenaye	Ralph J. McGuire
William D. Craig	Paul M. Miller
David C. Cuthell	Robert E. Moberly
Philip M. Dale, Jr.	James D. Moffett
Nathaniel Davis	Thomas H. Murfin
Robert D. Davis	John L. Murphy
John M. Dennis	William Nesselhof, Jr.
Frank J. Devine	Cleo A. Noel, Jr.
John B. Dexter	Richard B. Parker
William B. Dunn	John M. Perry
Samuel D. Eaton	Chris G. Petrow
Hermann F. Elits	Robert M. Phillips
Richard A. Ericson, Jr.	Paul O. Proehl
Richard T. Ewing	Ernest E. Ramsaur, Jr.
John M. Farrior	John B. Root
John W. Fisher	Robert W. Ross
Wayne W. Fisher	James R. Rucht
Benjamin A. Fleck	Samuel O. Ruff
Robert C. Foulon	John A. Sabini
A. Eugene Frank	Mrs. Corey B. Sander-son
James A. Garvey	Dwight E. Scarbrough
John N. Gatch, Jr.	Robert Simpson
Scott George	Michel F. Smith
Howard C. Goldsmith	Karl E. Sommerlatte
Herbert Gordon	C. Melvin Sonne, Jr.
John G. Gossett	G. Alonzo Stanford
Philip C. Habib	Kenedon P. Steins
Philip E. Haring	Harrison M. Symmes, Jr.
Gregory Henderson	Herbert B. Thompson
Robert S. Henderson	John M. Thompson, Jr.
Converse Hettinger	Edward J. Thrasher
John H. Holdridge	Edward J. Trost
Walter P. Houk	Gordon C. Tullock
Paul R. Hughes	Francis T. Underhill, Jr.
Vernon V. Hukee	Viron P. Vaky
Edward C. Ingraham, Jr.	Philip H. Valdes
Richard G. Johnson	George S. Vest
Howard D. Jones	Theodore A. Wahl
Ralph A. Jones	John Patrick Walsh
Harold G. Josif	Milton C. Walstrom
Abbott Judd	Herbert E. Weiner
Warren A. Kelsey	Arthur D. Weininger
Jack T. Kilgore	William H. Witt
Richard H. Lamb	Chalmers B. Wood
James F. Leonard, Jr.	Matthew J. Wysong
Edward T. Long	Elmer E. Yelton
Matthew J. Loomam, Jr.	John B. Young
Roye L. Lowry	Robert W. Zimmermann
John E. MacDonald	
Robert J. MacQuaid	
Frank E. Maestroni	

To be consuls general of the United States of America

Heyward G. Hill
Paul W. Meyer
Edward D. McLaughlin
Robert E. Ward, Jr.

To be consuls of the United States of America

Robin E. Steussy	Leo S. Disher, Jr.
Walter E. Kneeland	Robert W. Ehrman
Joseph H. Rogatnick	Archibald B. Roosevelt, Jr.
Arthur Doak Barnett	
Philip J. Conley	

To be vice consuls of the United States of America

Peter J. C. Adam	Robert W. Kerwin
Wilson P. Dizard, Jr.	Glenn Lee Smith

To be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Robert G. Caldwell
Herbert Cerwin
Bruce Butties

To be Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

William G. Allen	Henry Lee, Jr.
G. Michael Bache	William B. Miller
Alan L. Campbell, Jr.	Richard D. Nethercut
William R. Crawford, Jr.	Augustus L. Putnam
Robert B. Houston, Jr.	Robert A. Remole
Richard E. Johnson	Ralph S. Saul
Frederick Joseph	Kennedy B. Schmertz
Myron Brockway Lawrence	William C. Sherman
	Robert K. Sherwood
	Christopher A. Squire

IN THE ARMY

CHIEF CHEMICAL OFFICER, UNITED STATES ARMY, AND MAJOR GENERAL IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Brig. Gen. Egbert Frank Bullene, O9708, United States Army, for appointment as Chief Chemical Officer, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major general

Maj. Gen. William Maynadier Miley, O11232.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. William Shepard Biddle, O15180.
Brig. Gen. Charles Edward Hart, O15788.
Brig. Gen. Charles Draper William Canham, O16496.

Temporary appointments in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Samuel Davis Sturgis, Jr., O9325.
Brig. Gen. George Jacob Nold, O8888.
Brig. Gen. Joseph Sladen Bradley, O12428.
Brig. Gen. William Stevens Lawton, O14924.
Brig. Gen. James Edward Moore, O15650.
Brig. Gen. Bruce Cooper Clarke, O16068.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Arthur Seymour Champeny, O8264.
Col. Numa Augustin Watson, O14968.
Col. William Peirce Ennis, Jr., O16436.
Col. Thomas Edward de Shazo, O16479.
Col. John Simpson Guthrie, O18228.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

PROMOTIONS

The nominations of Martin Williams Baumgaertner and other officers, for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and section 306 of the Women's Armed Service Integration Act of 1948, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 28, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Martin Williams Baumgaertner, which appears on page 5898, and ending with the name of Edna Haley Farry, which appears on page 5900.

APPOINTMENTS

The nominations of Archibald G. M. Martin III, et al., for appointment in the United States Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 29, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Archibald G. M.

Martin III, which is shown on page 5968, and ending with the name of Thomas C. Pinckney, Jr., which appears on page 5969.

IN THE NAVY

PERMANENT APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral:

Rear admiral, line

Charles D. Wheelock	John P. Whitney
Richard M. Watt, Jr.	Hugh H. Goodwin
Paul E. Pihl	Edgar A. Cruise
Wilson D. Leggett, Jr.	Thomas B. Brittain
Harold D. Baker	Richard P. Glass
Herbert E. Regan	Clark L. Green
Thomas M. Stokes	Leon J. Huffman
Robert E. Blick, Jr.	Harold A. Houser
Frank T. Watkins	John M. Higgins
Tom B. Hill	John B. Pearson, Jr.
Carl F. Espe	

Rear admiral, Medical Corps

Leslie O. Stone
Clifford A. Swanson

Rear admiral, Supply Corps

George F. Yoran
Robert F. Batchelder

Rear admiral, Civil Engineer Corps

William O. Hiltabidle, Jr.

The nominations of Kemp Tolley and other officers for permanent appointment in the Navy to the grade and corps indicated, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on June 4, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Kemp Tolley, which appears on page 6082, and ending with the name of Henry H. Laramore, which is shown on page 6084.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of ensign in the Staff Corps of the Navy as indicated:

Supply Corps

Andrew L. Frahler

Civil Engineer Corps

James W. Murray
Richard K. Pulling

The following-named officer of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Navy in lieu of the line as previously nominated and confirmed:

Andrew L. Frahler

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Alan G. Lewis (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed to correct name.

Richard Y. Kelly (civilian college graduate) to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

The following-named women (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Rosemary D. Arenth	Betty R. Kunzman
Kathleen D. Beck	Diana McNair
Marion C. Brenner	Bertha S. Miller
Emily J. Byrd	Mary V. Moore
Nancy J. Chapman	Faye P. Overton
Shirley J. Clare	Frances MacD. Patch
Mary T. Connors	Bette J. Pickett
Yvonne C. Fossen-kemper	Mary-Jeanette M. Rayner
Nellie M. Grieve	Louise B. Rogerson
Louise E. Griffin	Agnes I. Rupp
Elizabeth Hart	Mary E. Sheffels
George Hodges	Suzanne S. Shera
Mitzie L. Jacobson	Margaret F. Smith
Ethel R. Klein	Ann Thompson
Sibyl L. Kuhnle	Ruth V. Whitfield

The following-named women (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Elizabeth L. Childers
Clair Cook

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant commander

Rufus J. Pearson, Jr.

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert H. Palmer, Jr.	Roger P. Smitley
Clifford C. Roosa	James N. Waggoner
Fitzhugh N. Hamrick	to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Belva L. Coole	Virginia Marfia
Winifred L. Copeland	Rachel A. Nantz
June M. Elssesser	Margaret E. Nix
Evelyn C. Foht	Mary L. O'Donnell
Susan M. Hanley	Elizabeth Pope
Mary H. Harris	Julia E. Scarcello
Viola M. Hofer	Dorothy J. Shields
Regina M. Holland	Iris M. Stock
Wanda J. Humphrey	Mary T. Taylor
Barbara J. Hundley	Annie R. White
Dorothy V. Krause	

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy for limited duty only:

Ensigns

Albert Antar	Richard E. Mikkelsen
Harold S. Birdsong	Peter E. Moll, Jr.
Arthur A. Bish	Robert L. Moore
Donald "D" Butler	Alucey D. Mosley
John J. Bramblett, Jr.	Sylvester F. North
Francis E. Carnicom	James P. Padgett
John T. Childs	John K. Pegues, Jr.
Earl D. Christensen	Robert Pescott
John H. Church	Everett R. Peugh
Ernest L. Cobern	Lloyd G. Peterson, Jr.
James E. Criner	Robert E. Pierce
Peter DellaRocca	Joseph E. Pinning
Frank Dievendorff	Harry B. Pitcher, Jr.
Charles A. Dodd	Wilbur P. Powers
Philip M. Dyer	Walter A. Ramsey
Otis E. Engelman	Garlin R. Read
George J. Evans	Irvin W. Reed
Julius E. Fuchs	Albert R. Reid
Adolph J. Furtek	Benjamin G. Sailors
Robert D. Gale	William G. Sandberg
Bernard H. Garrett	Albert G. Sentman
Homer A. Giddens	Eloy J. Shafer
Herman E. Goebel, Jr.	George T. Sinclair, Jr.
William L. Halleck	Jack D. Smith
Theodore P. Henriksen	George Stenke
James "B" Hobbs	Joseph St. Marie
John C. Hounihan	Preston G. Thomas
Donnie W. Huckaby	Ted K. Tillotson
William L. Hutton	William O. Thomson
Jack R. Ingram	Jackson M. Tomskey
Robert G. Jacks	Mike J. Trenn
Cecil King	John C. Valek
Everett N. Leach	William McK. Villines, Jr.
William R. Leibold	Willard F. Waterfield, Jr.
John D. Lewallen	Arthur C. White
Joe J. Lillienfeld	George W. Whitman
Eugene J. McGuire	Raymond O. Wilkinson
George W. Macauley	William R. Yarwood
Armido E. Mancini	

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy for limited duty only:

Ensigns

Donavon E. Abraham	Lowell A. Reade
Charles H. McKenzie	Clarence E. Reed
George W. Nelson	

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy for limited duty only:

Ensigns

David H. Bodtke
Robert A. Martin

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 19, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the Lord God omnipotent and omniscient, may we daily come to the sacrament of public service richly endowed with the grace of insight, the gift of interpretation, and the sinews of moral and spiritual strength.

We pray that we may always have the leading of Thy divine spirit and beseech Thee to create within us those desires which Thou dost delight to satisfy.

May it be the goal of all our aspirations to build a finer and nobler social order and to bring praise and glory to Thy great and holy name.

Grant that the day may be hastened when the blessings of freedom and democracy shall be the glorious possession of all mankind.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) entitled "Concurrent resolution reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union."

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to address the House on Tuesday, June 26, for 1 hour, and on Wednesday, June 27, for 1 hour, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4496) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4496, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, July 4 in any year, when our people celebrate the anniversary of the day when that famous historic document, the Declaration of Independence, was signed, is a very important day, but this year it is particularly important in view of the fact that it is the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of that immortal document which preceded and which is just as much a part of our fundamental law as the Constitution itself.

The President of the United States has appointed a Commission in connection with the one hundred and seventy-fifth celebration of the signing of the Declaration of Independence consisting of the Vice President of the United States, our beloved Speaker, the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, the majority and minority leaders of the House, and the majority and minority leaders of the Senate.

We are hopeful that in every city and town throughout every State of the Union there will be a most active celebration this year of the anniversary of this historic event. I can assure the Members of the House that already there is a tremendously favorable response throughout the country, but we are hopeful that the open and public manifestation of our love as Americans for that historic document will evidence itself this year to the maximum extent humanly possible by all Americans, and that each Governor will make the necessary proclamation and do everything possible within his State, and the mayors of all cities and the duly constituted authorities of all towns and communities will take such action and give such leadership within their communities that this year the maximum celebration humanly possible will be engaged in and that religious, civic, and educational leaders will do the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the minority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with the majority leader in urging a widespread observance of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. At this time when liberty is in peril all over the world, it is an opportune time for the American people to learn the truth and permit

them to rally to the support of the precious rights enunciated by our forefathers. As a member of this Commission, I am pleased that the response to a July 4 celebration is so universal throughout the country. I join my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts in urging the fullest possible observance of the issuance of this sacred document. And it is particularly proper that the center of its celebration should be in old Philadelphia where the cracked liberty bell is a constant reminder of our heritage.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, may I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Independence Homecoming Committee of the city of Philadelphia is planning to have a token session of the Congress on the 4th of July in Independence Hall. I hold in my hand a communication addressed to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. He has consulted me, and we are hopeful that we can get a sufficient number of Members to go there and engage in a debate apropos of the questions under discussion at the time, and which in all probability will be televised in that historic center. I call this to the attention of the Members in order to have it before them at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend. I hope the response will be very large. We all know that the State of Pennsylvania and the city of Philadelphia are going to have a historic celebration this year.

There is a bill pending before the House Committee on the Judiciary which has passed the Senate, and which I hope the committee will report soon, because it will have to if it is to be timely. I will do everything I can to try to get it through the House.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I am glad the gentleman has yielded to me immediately after the encouraging comment just made, because my purpose in asking him to yield has to do with the bill now pending. The State of Pennsylvania has already passed and the Governor has signed a similar bill. The city of Philadelphia is joining in and equally supporting this celebration.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is \$100,000 apiece.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. That is right. The United States has been asked to show a similar interest as has been evidenced by the other governmental units involved. I do hope the gentleman will do all he can to get a fairly early report on that measure.

May I also say with reference to the matter the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] has mentioned, having confidence as we all have in his ability at research, we hope he will help us to find a suitable revolutionary topic to be debated in a token session, and with the aid of the majority and minority